

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES AMONG THE APOCALYPSES

VOLUME I

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School  
of the University of Notre Dame  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Todd Russell Hanneken, A.B., M.T.S.

---

James C. VanderKam, Director

Graduate Program in Theology

Notre Dame, Indiana

June 2008

© Copyright by  
Todd Russell Hanneken  
2008  
All rights reserved

# THE BOOK OF JUBILEES AMONG THE APOCALYPSES

Abstract

by

Todd Russell Hanneken

The Book of Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to express a worldview that differs significantly from the cluster of ideas typically expressed by contemporary apocalypses. Jubilees has often been viewed as a borderline or ambiguous case among apocalypses. When viewed with the proper distinctions and definitions, Jubilees is indeed atypical but not ambiguous. Jubilees does use the genre “apocalypse,” but uses it ironically. Typically, the revelatory framework of apocalypses authorizes new esoteric wisdom. Transcendence on the spatial axis typically emphasizes the influence of cosmic powers and limits human agency. Transcendence on the temporal axis typically conveys a view of history in exponential decline culminating in “final woes” and a future restoration. Although the apocalypses express great variety in worldview, they form a cluster of compatible views around these issues inherent in the use of the genre. The genre creates a reader expectation that the typical worldview will be conveyed. Jubilees, however, uses the genre to address the definitive issues of the apocalyptic worldview, and consistently presents views radically different from the typical cluster of views. Thus, the revelation in Jubilees is a re-revelation of the single eternal revelation already familiar

Todd Russell Hanneken

and accessible to all of Israel. Humans are primarily responsible for sin, suffering, and the eschatological turning point. The eschatological turning point is natural, gradual, and most importantly, realized. The inversion of reader expectations can be called irony on purely literary grounds. The intent of the author is more speculative, but the quantity and quality of the subversions of the apocalyptic worldview by means of the literary genre suggest deliberate use of irony.

## CONTENTS

### Volume I

Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
1.1. Uses of genre in Jubilees .....	4
1.2. The apocalyptic worldview defined.....	8
1.3. Reader expectation and irony .....	13
1.4. Previous scholarship on Jubilees among the apocalypses .....	16
1.4.1. The reified view of “apocalyptic” and the expectation of “ <i>Gattung</i> ” .....	17
1.4.2. Theories of social continuity .....	19
1.4.3. Emphasis on issues other than worldview (the figure of Enoch and calendar) .....	24
Chapter 2: The History of Scholarship on the Genre of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature ...	30
2.1. The relationship between morphological, conceptual, and sociological features .....	35
2.1.1. The early form-content distinctions and the reification of apocalyptic.....	36
2.1.2. Gunkel’s concept of <i>Gattung</i> and the concept of genre promoted in the 1970s .....	45
2.1.3. Paul Hanson’s separation of literary genre and worldview.....	57
2.1.4. The apocalyptic worldview of which eschatology is one part .....	64
2.1.5. The radical divorce .....	71
2.1.6. The case for some relationship .....	76
2.2. The possibility of defining the genre “apocalypse” morphologically .....	78
2.2.1. The earlier alternatives .....	79
2.2.2. The purpose of a definition.....	84
2.2.3. The <i>Semeia</i> 14 definition.....	86
2.2.4. Resistance and clarifications .....	89
2.2.4.1. The supposed exclusivity between definition and description.....	90
2.2.4.2. The desire to say more .....	91
2.2.4.3. The desire to say less.....	95
2.2.4.4. The resistance to artificial boundaries.....	102
2.2.4.5. The push for a diachronic definition .....	103
2.2.5. The function amendment.....	104
2.2.6. Prototype theory .....	107

Chapter 3: The Text of the Book of Jubilees .....	111
3.1. The reliability of the texts available .....	112
3.2. Coherence of composition .....	121
3.2.1. Four general comments on theories of multiplicity of authorship .....	122
3.2.2. Some specific arguments .....	126
3.2.3. Segal's theory of the redaction of Jubilees .....	134
3.3. The Book of Jubilees was composed in the second century BCE, probably shortly after 159 BCE.....	141
3.3.1. The oldest manuscript and texts which presume Jubilees .....	146
3.3.2. Texts which Jubilees assumes .....	154
3.3.3. Historical circumstances and events reflected in the concerns, images and language of Jubilees .....	157
3.3.4. Wars.....	164
3.3.5. Possible and probable historical allusions in Jubilees 23 .....	166
 Chapter 4: The View of Revelation .....	182
4.1. The use and view of received authority .....	183
4.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	188
4.1.1.1. The use of Enochic traditions .....	188
4.1.1.2. The use of non-Enochic Jewish traditions.....	191
4.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses .....	195
4.1.2.1. The use of Danielic traditions .....	196
4.1.2.2. The use of non-Danielic Jewish traditions .....	202
4.1.3. Jubilees .....	208
4.1.3.1. The heavenly tablets.....	212
4.1.3.2. Departures from Genesis and Exodus .....	218
Psalm 90 in Jubilees 23 .....	219
Third Isaiah in Jubilees 23 .....	222
The covenant curses in Jubilees 23 .....	227
4.2. The dependence of revelation on wisdom .....	232
4.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	237
4.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses .....	240
4.2.3. Jubilees .....	245
4.2.3.1. Revelation without the elitism of wisdom.....	246
4.2.3.2. Revelation made unambiguous and accessible .....	252

## Volume II

Chapter 5: The Spatial Axis.....	261
5.1. Angels and demons.....	264
5.1.1. Before the flood: the origin of evil .....	265
5.1.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	265
5.1.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses.....	268
5.1.1.3. Jubilees .....	269
5.1.2. After the flood: the persistence of demons .....	272

5.1.2.1. The early apocalypses .....	273
5.1.2.2. Jubilees .....	274
5.1.3. Angelic mediation .....	277
5.1.3.1. Evidence outside the apocalypses .....	277
5.1.3.2. The early apocalypses .....	281
5.1.3.3. Jubilees .....	283
5.1.4. The leader of evil.....	285
5.1.4.1. Terms, names and titles .....	286
5.1.4.2. Satan in non-apocalypse received scriptures.....	291
5.1.4.3. The early apocalypses .....	293
5.1.4.4. Mastema in Jubilees .....	294
5.1.5. Angels and demons in the eschatological crisis and restoration .....	301
5.1.5.1. The early apocalypses .....	302
5.1.5.2. Jubilees .....	304
Jubilees 23.....	305
The rest of the book .....	307
5.2. Humans .....	310
5.2.1. Groups .....	310
5.2.1.1. Third Isaiah .....	312
5.2.1.2. The Enochic apocalypses .....	313
5.2.1.3. The Danielic apocalypses.....	318
5.2.1.4. Jubilees .....	320
5.2.2. Violence.....	329
5.2.2.1. Third Isaiah .....	332
5.2.2.2. The Enochic apocalypses .....	332
5.2.2.3. The Danielic apocalypses.....	334
5.2.2.4. Jubilees .....	338
Chapter 6: The Temporal Axis .....	347
6.1. The decline of history .....	349
6.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	349
6.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel .....	353
6.1.3. Jubilees .....	355
6.2. The final woes.....	357
6.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	359
6.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses .....	366
6.2.3. Jubilees .....	367
6.2.3.1. The “final woes” are just chastisement from God as prescribed by the covenant. ....	369
6.2.3.2. The “final woes” have already been fulfilled.....	371
6.2.3.3. The white children.....	379
6.3. The judgment.....	385
6.3.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	386
6.3.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel .....	388
6.3.3. Jubilees .....	391
6.3.3.1. Jubilees 23 .....	392

6.3.3.2. The rest of Jubilees .....	395
Judgment in Jubilees 5 .....	396
The role of Enoch in judgment.....	397
The judgment of individual nations .....	400
6.4. The restoration .....	405
6.4.1. Third Isaiah.....	406
6.4.2. The Enochic apocalypses .....	408
6.4.3. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel .....	412
6.4.4. Jubilees .....	413
6.4.4.1. The restoration in Jubilees 23 is gradual and has already begun. ....	414
6.4.4.2. The restoration in Jubilees as a whole restores and fulfills the original plan of creation. ....	417
Revelation .....	418
The people of Israel.....	420
The land of Israel .....	426
The sanctuary .....	429
The calendar .....	430
6.4.4.3. The periods of history in Jubilees .....	433
6.5. Conclusion to the chapter on the temporal axis.....	434
6.6. Appendices: Background issues and difficult readings related to the temporal axis .....	436
6.6.1. The problem of the correlation between longevity and righteousness ....	436
6.6.2. Who were the descendents of Lot and Caphtor in the second century BCE? .....	439
6.6.3. Jubilees 32 promises conquest in the land of Israel, not a global empire.....	442
6.6.4. The sanctification of the land .....	447
6.6.5. Jubilees 1:26-29 identifies the indwelling of the sanctuary in the restoration with the indwelling of the sanctuary of Aaron.....	449
6.6.6. The fiftieth year in Leviticus 25 and Jubilees 50 .....	456
Chapter 7: Review of Ironic Use of the Genre “Apocalypse” in Jubilees .....	460
7.1. Jubilees 1, the framework .....	462
7.2. Jubilees 2, creation.....	468
7.3. Jubilees 3-6, evil, injustice, and the lack thereof .....	469
7.4. Jubilees 10, the other nations.....	473
7.5. Jubilees 15, heavenly outsourcing .....	476
7.6. Jubilees 16-22, miscellanea .....	478
7.7. Jubilees 21, Enoch + Noah = Leviticus .....	480
7.8. Jubilees 23 .....	482
7.9. Jubilees 24-46, more miscellanea .....	498
7.10. Jubilees 30-32, six reasons to love Levites.....	499
7.11. Jubilees 39-43, “Do you not know that a man takes pleasure in his cup, as I do in this cup?” (the Joseph cycle) .....	505
7.12. Jubilees 47-50, revealing the past .....	507



Conclusion .....	510
Bibliography .....	515
Index of Modern Authors.....	534

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The Book of Jubilees is one of the longest, oldest, and most unified Jewish compositions from antiquity. Judging by the number of identifiable copies, it was among the most authoritative writings at Qumran. Composed in Hebrew, the work is known to have been translated into Greek, Latin, Ethiopic, and possibly Syriac, and gained canonical status in the Ethiopian Church. Nevertheless, Jubilees was largely forgotten in the Jewish and Christian traditions, except for occasional echoes. As the study of Judaism and Christianity looks beyond the constraints of canon, Jubilees offers a special insight into Jewish thought in the middle of the second century before our era. Even with recent increased attention, Jubilees can still be called understudied, if only because of its great potential to cast light on so many fields of inquiry. In the past, Jubilees has been particularly appreciated, but not exhausted, for insights into biblical interpretation and Qumran origins. The literary genre of Jubilees has been studied principally in relation to “rewritten scripture” or “rewritten bible,” although it is widely recognized that Jubilees also warrants comparison with the apocalypses. Jubilees has been viewed as a hazy case among the apocalypses, and lack of precision in calling Jubilees somewhat or partially apocalyptic has contributed to misuse or misrepresentation of the work in a number of studies.

The present study seeks to bring clarity to the relationship between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses by applying rigorous definitions, distinguishing the literary genre “apocalypse” from the apocalyptic worldview, and deferring speculation about social location and function. On the level of literary genre, Jubilees does use the genre “apocalypse.” On the level of worldview, Jubilees differs substantially from the typical apocalypses on the issues raised inherently by the literary genre. Thus, Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to express a worldview that is not apocalyptic, and indeed anti-apocalyptic.

This observation has significant implications. It is one thing for the worldview that is typical of the apocalypses to be expressed without the literary genre (Paul and the sectarian literature from Qumran being the most discussed examples), but another to use the genre without the worldview. The use of genre has meaning independent of what is said by means of the genre. The most basic literary function of a genre is to create reader expectations. When a reader or audience reads or hears the definitive features of apocalypses, a reader expects certain typical ideas to be expressed. Discord results when the expected ideas conflict with the ideas actually expressed. On a purely literary level, apart from questions of authorial intent and social function, this discord between expected and actual meaning can be described as irony. The question of *why* a second century BCE author would do such a thing is inherently more speculative and outside the scope of the evidence and argumentation of this dissertation, although a few considerations will be presented in the final chapter.

The principle of “reader expectations” helps to explain why Jubilees has often been lumped together with the Enochic apocalypses in modern scholarship. Modern readers form expectations that can be so strong that differences are not seen at all, or seen

only in small slices. Unlike the ancient readers, modern readers are often impaired by expectations based on anachronistic classifications. Jubilees is like 1 Enoch in that it is canonical in the Ethiopic church, but excluded from all other canons. Jubilees is more or less pseudepigraphic. Jubilees expands positively the figure of Enoch. Jubilees is well represented at Qumran, where Enochic literature was preserved and literature with an apocalyptic worldview was produced. However, none of these are good reasons to conclude that Jubilees conveys an apocalyptic worldview. The categories of canon and “false ascription” do not belong to a historical-critical investigation of Jubilees in its original context. Regardless of later developments and various hypotheses, there is insufficient evidence that the figure of Enoch defined a fundamental rift in Judaism in the 150s BCE. The fact that Jubilees was influential at Qumran, even right along side compositions that convey an apocalyptic worldview, does not resolve the question of the worldview of Jubilees. The sectarians used Deuteronomy far more than they used the Enochic apocalypses, and one could hardly argue that there are no differences in worldview between Deuteronomy and the Enochic apocalypses. The sectarians represented at Qumran did not maintain orthodoxy in their own writings, and they certainly did not maintain a strict standard for ideas that could be found in their collections. These misleading associations often operate below consciousness. It is not the case that such false expectations have corrupted a thorough study. The problem is that there has never been a thorough study of the use of the literary genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees, distinct from the worldview and apart from speculation about social location. This study aims to fill a lacuna and correct a wide body of casual generalizations and unexamined assumptions about Jubilees.

The introduction will proceed in four stages. First, the uses of genre in Jubilees will be addressed, with particular attention to the lack of contradiction in saying that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” and also uses (or is an example of) “rewritten scripture.” Second, the apocalyptic worldview will be defined in relationship to, but distinguishable from, literary genre. Third, we will clarify what is meant by reader expectation and literary irony, and how they can be separated from more speculative questions of authorial intent and social location. The introduction will conclude with a survey of previous scholarship on the place of Jubilees among the apocalypses.

### 1.1. Uses of genre in Jubilees

Chapter 2 will explore at length the history of scholarship distinguishing between literary genre and worldview, defining the genre “apocalypse,” and understanding the purpose and limits of a morphological definition of a literary genre. By way of introduction, a few basic points should be laid out.

First, I find it helpful to ask, not whether a work or passage *is* an apocalypse, but whether it *uses* the genre “apocalypse.”<sup>1</sup> This helps to avoid the impression that by

---

<sup>1</sup> The “classical” or “Aristotelian” concept of genre taxonomy was binary and exclusive. A work was either in or out of a category, like a container, and could only be a member of one category. No internal structure distinguished members within the category. Today it is recognized that there are many levels at which generic relationships can exist, and different ways a work can *use* a genre in the broader sense. John Frow, *Genre*, ed. John Drakakis, The New Critical Idiom (London; New York: Routledge, 2006), 53-55. Michael Sinding, “After Definitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science,” *Genre* 35 (2002): 181, 185. Carol A. Newsom, “Spying out the Land: A Report from Genology,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis Robert Magary (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 445. Similarly, Jacques Derrida prefers to say a work “participates” in a genre. Jacques Derrida, “The Law of Genre,” in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. David Duff, Longman Critical Readers (Harlow, England; New York: Longman, 2000; reprint, originally published in *Glyph* 7 (1980), 202-213. Translated by Avital Ronell.), 224, 230.

identifying use of genre, scholars have established something conclusive and exclusive about the essence of a work. In the case of “apocalypse,” I do think that the genre is more than just a construct for the convenience of modern scholars; it was a tool used by ancient authors to construct literature so as to convey meaning (it does not matter how much they were aware of it, or whether they labeled and systematized the rules in a handbook). Answering whether Jubilees is an apocalypse is not an end in itself, but the first step to asking further questions, starting with *how* Jubilees uses the genre.

Second, a work can use more than one genre. This study focuses on the use of the genre “apocalypse,” but does not deny that Jubilees also is an example of—or uses the genre of—“rewritten scripture.” At the level of worldview there is a certain tension in the implications of framing rewritten scripture as an apocalypse. This tension will be discussed in Chapter 4, but it does not negate the principle of compatibility of multiple genres at the literary level. I am not claiming that Jubilees uses no other literary tools, or has no other concerns than rejecting the apocalyptic worldview. Based only on “volume” within the work, one might say that Jubilees uses “rewritten scripture” more than “apocalypse.” It seems that recent scholarship has paid more attention to Jubilees as “rewritten scripture,” but I do think that use of the genre “apocalypse” has been underestimated, particularly for the special significance in framing the work. For example, Michael Segal’s recent monograph devotes a section to the literary genre of

---

Chapter 2 will discuss the case for distinguishing literary morphology and worldview, which will allow us to describe the ways Jubilees is and is not a typical apocalypse. Prototype theory is one way of saying some apocalypses are more typical than others (see below, Section 2.2.6). Indeed, Jubilees is not a prototypical apocalypse in that it mixes literary genres and is not typical at the level of worldview. A clear definition of the literary morphology does not deny other levels at which a work can be typical or atypical. Jubilees is *among* the apocalypses. It *uses* the literary morphology of the genre, but to say Jubilees *is* an apocalypse may obscure the differences at other levels included in the broader concerns of genre theory.

Jubilees, but makes no mention of “apocalypse.” This leaves nothing to say of the beginning, middle, and end of the work except that they are “formally anomalous.”<sup>2</sup> If only by virtue of location, and not total volume, the genre used in the literary framework bears a special (certainly not exclusive) significance for understanding the work.

I would say further that the genre “apocalypse” pervades the Book of Jubilees, well beyond chapters 1, 23 and 50. Every time we read, “Now you Moses write down...,” every time first person forms are used for angels, and every time the heavenly tablets are mentioned, we are reminded of the revelatory framework. Within this framework, the discussions of the agency of angels and demons, the agency and classification of humanity, the times and places of judgment and restoration, and the broader scope of history, all constitute use of the genre. It certainly would have been easier to write a study of one or two chapters, but the fact of the matter is that Jubilees pushes the “apocalypse” buttons throughout the book.

Along similar lines, the discord which I am describing is not the result of apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic sources redacted together. Rather, it is precisely when using the genre “apocalypse” that Jubilees inverts the worldview typically implied by the genre. Jubilees 23 was originally responsible for the observation developed here, and does provide a special concentration of interesting examples. However, at the end of research I believe that the same case could be made had the chapter been lost. Chapter 3 will consider further the coherence of the work.

---

<sup>2</sup> “Units 1, 4, and 7 [chapters 1, 23, and 50] are formally anomalous: both regarding their location and their content; they are not direct rewritings of the pentateuchal stories, but rather serve as a literary framework, both surrounding and within the rewritten stories.” Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 3-5.

Chapters 4-6 will consider the worldview typically implied in the three parts of the morphological definition of the literary genre apocalypse: the view of revelation, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis.<sup>3</sup> In each case it is fairly clear that Jubilees uses the literary genre. To summarize, the revelation mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient appears in chapters 1, 50, and every time the reader is reminded that an angel of the presence is dictating the heavenly tablets to Moses. The transcendent spatial reality concerning a supernatural world appears most clearly and frequently when the agency of good and bad angels and demons is discussed. Along similar lines, the explanation of suffering, the classification of groups of humanity, the comments on the cosmic efficacy of violence, and the spatial boundaries of places of judgment and restoration, all constitute ways in which Jubilees uses the definitive features of the apocalypses on the spatial axis. Jubilees 23 is special in that it concentrates unmistakable use of transcendence on the temporal axis, particularly in explaining events current to the “actual” audience within a survey of the meaning of history. Temporal transcendence can be found elsewhere in the forms and issues of a structured view of history, a new creation, and day(s) of judgment for individuals and nations. It is true that Jubilees spreads out the use of the genre among other literary devices and concerns; consequently, one would not want to say Jubilees “is” an apocalypse, if that were to mean that all of Jubilees can be explained as an apocalypse and nothing else can be said of literary genre in Jubilees. Still, Jubilees uses the literary genre “apocalypse” more than some works that are easily considered apocalypses.

---

<sup>3</sup> John J. Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” *Semeia* 14 (1979): 9. In the present work, page 86.



The difficulty is not in identifying use of the genre, but in distinguishing literary genre from worldview. The history of scholarship on this issue will be considered in Chapter 2. By way of a general introduction, the simplest rule of thumb is to separate the issues raised from what is said about the issues. An issue can be raised simply by use of language such as “heavenly tablets,” “demons,” “day of judgment,” or “new creation.” In each of these cases, there is no doubt that Jubilees uses the literary forms and literary contents necessary both to raise these issues and to trigger certain reader expectations as to what will be said about them.

After identifying the presence of an issue, the key is to ask two further questions: What do apocalypses typically say about the issue, and does Jubilees agree? Thus, one finds that heavenly tablets typically reveal otherwise unknowable esoteric mysteries, but not in Jubilees. Apocalypses typically use angels and demons to explain suffering in general and the present suffering in particular—not so in Jubilees. The day of judgment is typically deferred and cosmos-wide, but in Jubilees every individual and nation is judged justly in its own time. Each of these differences operates at the more abstract level of worldview. Thus we come to defining the apocalyptic worldview in relationship to the literary genre.

## 1.2. The apocalyptic worldview defined

The apocalyptic worldview is the worldview typically conveyed by the literary genre “apocalypse.” Four elaborations are necessary: first to justify the dependent definition, second to qualify the appropriateness of chronological specification, third to

qualify the worldview as a pattern, not a systematic orthodoxy, and finally to describe the typical worldview.

Dependent definitions for distinct terms are appropriate for different, but closely related, layers of abstraction. Chapter 2 will consider the history of scholarship that called for treating the worldview and literary forms as necessarily co-incident, completely unrelated, or in a typical relationship. For example, it makes sense to define “apocalypse” in such a way that does not depend on a definition of “prophecy,” partly because of the difficulty of defining “prophecy.” The literary genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview occur together often enough that the worldview can be understood in terms of the genre. There are two basic cases for maintaining a distinction. First, the worldview sometimes appears without the genre (especially Paul and sectarian literature found at Qumran). By defining the worldview as distinct from but dependent on the genre, we can speak clearly both of what is typical and what is variant. Second, in order to account for the possibility of irony, it is necessary to define the genre without recourse to the worldview, and to qualify the relationship between the worldview and the genre as typical but capable of variation.<sup>4</sup> There is another reason not to define the apocalyptic worldview first and then define the genre dependently. Literary genre operates at a lower, or more robust, layer of abstraction, and thus can be defined and measured more objectively.

---

<sup>4</sup> Independent definitions run the risk of failing to mesh where appropriate, and too many definitions can lead to semantic confusion. Thus Collins warns, “To speak of apocalypses that are not apocalyptic can only compound the semantic confusion.” Collins was referring to the problem when “Apocalyptic” is reified independent of texts, such that “Apocalyptic” cannot be substantiated from apocalypses, or certain apocalypses cannot be called “Apocalyptic.” This point is valid and is not intended to exclude the possibility of irony. In Jubilees there is a relationship between the literary genre and the typical worldview, only it is an inverse relationship. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 13.

It is possible to define the literary genre in such a way that spans significant time and space. The definition of the genre defines the scope within which diachronic developments take place. It is sometimes necessary to qualify statements about the literary genre according to more specific sub-sets, such as “the historical apocalypses,” “the Enochic apocalypses,” the “early apocalypses,” etc. In the case of the worldview, there is an additional need to qualify the sub-class. For the present study, the important qualifier of the worldview is “at the time of Jubilees,” which includes works written at that time and older works as they were read at that time. As different as the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses may be, it is striking that Jubilees diverges from them fundamentally, at the level at which they overlap.

Along similar lines, it is important to be clear that “the apocalyptic worldview” is not a single, coherent, systematic set of theological principles. If one speaks generally enough it may be possible to say something minimal about the worldview of every apocalypse. Even then it would be a pattern, not a continuously transmitted orthodoxy. We can be more specific by applying the qualifier “at the time of Jubilees,” and further still by addressing the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses separately, and then the individual texts within these corpora. On all but the most qualified statements, if one wishes to speak of “*the* apocalyptic worldview,” it is necessary to understand the worldview as a cluster of compatible perspectives. The cluster must be broad enough to include all the apocalypses (or the appropriately qualified sub-set), but should still be distinctive of the apocalypses. In practice, this is easier than it sounds. For all the variations among the apocalypses, at a certain basic layer of worldview there is a remarkable degree of compatibility. There is a certain overlap in most or all Jewish religious texts from a particular time period, but the apocalypses at the time of Jubilees

form a distinctive cluster of compatible perspectives. Jubilees consistently and conspicuously falls outside the cluster.

It is not a coincidence that there is a relatively high degree of compatibility in worldview among texts at the time of Jubilees that use the genre “apocalypse.” The use of a genre conveys meaning, and certain literary forms and contents lend themselves to the expression of certain views. For example, the revelatory framework of cosmic knowledge through an angelic intermediary to an exemplary human lends itself to presenting information that could not be learned or authorized by more mundane means, such as observation and reason. Attention to agents and places on the spatial axis—besides humans and God—lends itself to arguing that these other agents have a significant impact on the situation of humans in their relationship to God. Transcendence on the temporal axis lends itself to the view that the present situation is a time unlike other naturally-known times. As described by Collins,

The essential ingredients of this worldview were a reliance on supernatural revelation, over and above received tradition and human reasoning; a sense that human affairs are determined to a great degree by supernatural agents; and the belief that human life is subject to judgment, culminating in reward or punishment after death.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> John J. Collins, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism Volume 1, the Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 1998), 157 (cf. 147). Collins elsewhere offered an alternative formulation, “The essential elements of this worldview are a lively belief in the role of the supernatural forces in shaping human behavior and an equally lively belief in the certainty of a final definitive judgment that will not only set matters right on earth (if the earth is thought to endure) but also provide everlasting reward or punishment for individual behavior.” John J. Collins, “The Legacy of Apocalypticism,” in *Encounters with Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005), 161-162. Collins has elsewhere emphasized the perception that something is fundamentally wrong with the world, and that the world is mysterious such that a supernatural source is needed. John J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. L. G. Perdue (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1993; reprint, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997), 171. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 8.

Chapters 4-6 will consider the primary sources in detail to illustrate clearly what can be said of the worldview of particular apocalypses, the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses generally, and more generally still the apocalypses at the time of Jubilees. Empirical observation of the apocalypses confirms a basic outline of worldview that one might expect to be implicit in the genre.<sup>6</sup> The immediate implications of the literary genre are the best start, but do not necessarily exhaust the distinctive features that can be found at the level of worldview. Section 2.1.4 below will discuss the importance of not letting any one aspect exclude all others as a single definitive feature of the apocalyptic worldview.<sup>7</sup>

The remarkable observation is not that the apocalypses form a compatibility in worldview around these issues. The remarkable observation is that Jubilees subverts the genre, using it to say something other than what it most naturally lends itself to saying.<sup>8</sup> The relationship between the literary genre and the worldview is typically close enough that the genre creates a predictable reader expectation, the inversion of which can be described as irony.

---

<sup>6</sup> Stemming from the same point, the categories used for chapters 4-6 are not arbitrary or self-serving. The views of revelation, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis are the natural categories of worldview typically implied by the literary genre “apocalypse.”

<sup>7</sup> Other “key” features of the worldview have been proposed and debated. Some would emphasize or de-emphasize eschatology, the “parentage” of the apocalypses in prophecy or wisdom, dualism, a particular mode of revelation, temple cosmology, or none of the above.

<sup>8</sup> To foreshadow briefly the development of these points in chapters 4-6: Jubilees frames as an apocalypse revelation that is already familiar and publicly accessible to all of Israel. Jubilees maintains that covenantal fidelity grants Israel immunity from demons and capricious angels, who only exist to lead other nations away from Israel’s exclusive relationship with God, and to punish those of Israel who align themselves with the nations. Jubilees explains the “recent” cycle of sin-punishment-repentance-(incipient) restoration in terms of the “Deuteronomic” cycle of history. There is nothing about the present moment that is fundamentally different or fixed outside of human choice. Further, the “eschatological” restoration is the fulfillment, not reformation, of Jewish tradition.

### 1.3. Reader expectation and irony

All literature uses some degree of genre that creates some degree of reader expectation. In the case of apocalypses in the 150s BCE, reader expectations form in both of two ways. First, and more theoretically, the above described principle of meaning implicit in the manner of communication (illocution) generates a basic level of reader expectation. Genres do not come from nowhere, but, even if a reader had no experience with the literary forms, the reader would assume that a matter is raised because it is deemed relevant. Fortunately, we can add a second and more robust standard for asserting and studying the basis of reader expectations. We have a good variety of apocalypses that existed around the time of Jubilees, and we have good reason to believe that others existed but were not fully preserved. We need not assume that any one apocalypse defined for the audience the genre and worldview, but we can safely assume that readers had knowledge of the literary genre and typical worldview, based on direct or indirect familiarity with any number of apocalypses. Expectation based on such prior knowledge is triggered by the use of the literary genre.

Reader expectation is not a conscious process. One might think of Pavlov's dog, who was conditioned to salivate in expectation of food at the sound of a bell. A better analogy would be a dog that salivates at the sound of dog food being poured into its bowl. One who hears or reads certain generic triggers immediately expects certain ideas to be expressed. If the reader pays attention to what is said, the conscious recognition of the ideas conveyed can either agree or disagree with expectations. In most cases there is basic agreement and the process goes unnoticed. A small disagreement can be incorporated into the treasury of experience, but a significant disagreement creates

discord. Without exploring further the ways the discord can be resolved, we can identify the discord between what a reader expects to be communicated and what is actually communicated in literary terms as irony.<sup>9</sup>

Unfortunately, the term “irony” is often used without precision. It is important to distinguish irony from sarcasm, satire, and parody. Literary irony can be understood independent of the intent of the author. The evidence and argumentation of the present work concern literary genre and worldview, not the social context that would be necessary to reconstruct the intent of the author. Further study of social setting and function may follow from observations of worldview, but is not prerequisite. This is especially true given our lack of direct knowledge of the social setting of Jubilees, and our only speculative knowledge of the social categories operative at the time.

The final chapter will consider some broad parameters within which the intent of the author should likely be understood. It is significant that the author of Jubilees articulates a worldview by use of contrast, but that alone does not tell us the intent of the author. Expressing one’s own distinctive worldview is not necessarily a matter of polemic. Although it is reasonable to surmise that the use of irony was intentional, we should not imagine that the composition of the Book of Jubilees was primarily motivated by antagonism toward the apocalyptic worldview. If the intent was to reconcile a discord by demonstrating compatibility, then the pattern might be described as harmonization. However, the quantity and quality of subversions of the apocalyptic worldview, and the

---

<sup>9</sup> There are, of course, variations. If the reader expects the different worldview then the use of the genre creates a discord that is resolved with the recognition of irony. If the reader expects ironic use of genre then the resolution comes as the otherwise discordant elements are presented. In any case, literary irony is present. The personal psychology and social setting of the reader are here deferred.

relatively superficial nature of the use of the genre, make it unlikely that harmonization would have been successful.

It is difficult to be more precise, however, in characterizing the subversion. Ridicule, humor, and parody are difficult to define, classify and establish on the basis of the evidence available. Satire can take different forms, depending on the harshness with which the target is contrasted with a normative position.<sup>10</sup> One approach to understanding the intent of the use of irony would be to look for social divisions that correspond to the division in worldview. Evidence does suggest that Jews were willing to kill each other over issues along the lines of Hellenistic assimilation, but it is far less clear that the disagreements in worldview considered here had significant social implications. For example, we know there were differences of opinion on whether the sovereignty of God over Israel is mediated by an angelic prince. We do not know whether the disagreement was the stuff of friendly discussion, group formation, or a symbolic token inseparable from the roots of violence.

There are elaborate theories about social and intellectual movements in Judaism at the time of Jubilees (particularly in terms of Qumran origins). The present literary study of Jubilees will not prove or disprove any such theory. It does, however, call for greater care in hypothesizing intellectual or social history on the basis of literary features. The study of social setting and function is not prerequisite to the study of genre and

---

<sup>10</sup> The traditional classification of satire follows the models of Horace and Juvenal. Horatian satire is not harsh, and could be found humorous even by the “target” of satire. The target can be oneself or one’s friends, and the critical edge is softened by friendly humor. Juvenalian satire attacks a target so bitterly that the target would certainly not be amused. Humor is at the expense of the target, and a clear “us vs. them” divide exists between the satirist and the target.



worldview, but the present study may contribute to further study of theories of religio-social phenomena at the time of Jubilees.

#### 1.4. Previous scholarship on Jubilees among the apocalypses

Three features distinguish the present approach from previous scholarship on Jubilees among the apocalypses. This study will (A) distinguish the genre “apocalypse” from the apocalyptic worldview, (B) defer social reconstruction and the relationship between instances of apocalypticism, and (C) systematically address the issues essential to the apocalyptic worldview. These three points provide the structure for the following. One often encounters slices of insight into one way or another that Jubilees is atypical. Many similarities and differences have been noted that do not pertain to the apocalyptic worldview. For example, the figure of Enoch and a certain calendar are not definitive of or coterminous with the apocalyptic worldview. I should emphasize that by discussing the position of Jubilees on the issues that define the apocalyptic worldview, I am not speaking exhaustively of the worldview of Jubilees. There are other issues.

Rather than cataloging the untenable statements made about Jubilees, the following will examine three structural problems that have prevented previous studies from identifying the ironic use of the genre “apocalypse.” A limited number of illustrative examples will be given. An effort will be made to include insights that point in the direction of the present study, even if they appear as footnotes in studies that push in very different directions. Many excellent studies have considered other aspects of Jubilees without advancing or contradicting the present observation. The least tenable

statements—those which assume Jubilees shares the ideas of ancient apocalypses—tend to appear in broad surveys.

#### 1.4.1. The reified view of “apocalyptic” and the expectation of “*Gattung*”

Chapter 2 surveys the history of the scholarship in which “Apocalyptic” is reified as a single coherent entity and approached as a *Gattung*, with an assertion of inseparability of literary forms, ideas, and setting in life. Before the 1970s, it would not have been possible even to ask if Jubilees uses the literary genre apocalypse to express an anti-apocalyptic worldview. Without observing a larger pattern, scholars did notice some significant ways in which Jubilees is atypical. For example, Russell often treated Jubilees as a sequel to the Book of the Watchers, expounding further the same thoughts. Yet, when tabulating the “new eschatology” of apocalyptic, he did observe an exception to the rule that transformation is not evolutionary but cataclysmic,

An exception to this is the Book of Jubilees, whose author apparently believes that the messianic age has already set in. Its growth would be gradual; men would grow in spiritual stature and nature would become gradually transformed.<sup>11</sup>

This is a big exception for a footnote, and a couple more footnotes would be appropriate on the same page for other ways in which Jubilees is exceptional. Still, this is a good example of one way in which the worldview of Jubilees is not like other apocalypses. The reification of “apocalyptic” into a single “method and message” prevented a systematic

---

<sup>11</sup> D. S. Russell, *The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC-AD 100*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), 269 n. 4.

explanation of the similarities and differences, but did not prevent individual insights into ways that Jubilees is atypical.

In some ways Christopher Rowland's work can be thought of as a reaction against—or at least an approach alternative to—the quest for precise distinctions and definitions pursued by Koch, Hanson, Stone, Collins, and so forth. Rowland approaches “apocalyptic” primarily as a religious perspective, and emphasizes diversity and flexibility over any definitive features. Even from this very different approach, a tension of form and contents in Jubilees is recognized, although Jubilees is ultimately subsumed into the “apocalyptic spirit.”<sup>12</sup>

Armin Lange is an exception to the general trend of emphasizing the similarities. He observes that Jubilees differs from “*Apokalyptik*” in the treatment of allegorical dreams. This important point will be taken up in the present work in Chapter 4. It is difficult to compare conclusions, however, since Lange approaches *Apokalyptik* as a movement (*Bewegung*), without thoroughly differentiating genre, worldview and religious-social phenomenon, “Eine Klassifikation des Jubiläenbuches als apokalyptische Schrift ist vor diesem Hintergrund abzulehnen.”<sup>13</sup> The point is certainly valid with respect to worldview, but does not negate the use of the literary genre in Jubilees, nor does it adequately establish that the apocalyptic movement existed or could only tolerate one idea about allegorical dreams.

---

<sup>12</sup> Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 51-52.

<sup>13</sup> “A classification of Jubilees as an apocalyptic writing is to be rejected on this basis.” Armin Lange, “Divinatorische Träume und Apokalyptik im Jubiläenbuch,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange (Tubingen: Mohr, 1997), 35.

Much like the problem when “apocalyptic” is treated as a coherent entity, Jubilees is easily misunderstood when individual ideas or motifs are treated as monolithic linear developments. An example that will come up in Chapter 5 of this work is the idea of “Satan.” It is often assumed that a single basic idea of “Satan” developed steadily and was referenced in many texts, each of which articulated only part of the motif. In this way, ideas of “Satan” thought to be contemporary with Jubilees are projected onto Jubilees, well beyond what is actually said of Mastema. Although Mastema warrants comparison with certain ideas about Satan, over-hasty identification has caused scholars to miss substantial differences (see further, Chapter 5).<sup>14</sup>

#### 1.4.2. Theories of social continuity

The question of whether the figure of Enoch defined a competing form of Judaism appears in the next sub-section. In the case of the pietists (*hasidim*) and groups assumed in the sectarian literature at Qumran, we can at least be confident that the designations had social significance in antiquity. The problems are in situating the author of Jubilees in relationship to these groups, and what that might tell us about the worldview of Jubilees.

When I say we lack specific knowledge of the religio-social setting of Jubilees, I do not mean we do not know whether the author was for or against Jason and Antiochus Epiphanes. I mean that such general knowledge does not tell us the worldview of

---

<sup>14</sup> A partial exception appears in Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), 183. “But the author’s theology, though definitely apocalyptic, is dominated by the supremacy of the Law, and this leads him to adapt the rebellion myth in certain crucial respects.”

Jubilees, since very different worldviews could have been held by those who opposed Jason and Antiochus. It is easy to forget how little direct evidence we have for the pietists. It may be likely that the author of Jubilees could have been considered a pietist, if the classification refers generally to those who opposed with religious zeal the reforms of Jason and Antiochus. If we say that the pietists were not only *sometimes* but *necessarily* militants who were willing to fight on the sabbath (1 Macc 2:41-42), then we already have a contradiction, or at least a development. Jubilees prohibits fighting on the sabbath (Jubilees 50:12), and arguably condemns militancy in general (see Chapter 5). If the author of Jubilees is to be counted among the pietists, then the classification must be so broad as to include a number of different ideas. If the authors of the Danielic apocalypses could also be described as pietists in a broad religio-social sense, then the classification would have included adherents to very different worldviews. We should not imagine that we have said something meaningful about the literature or the ideas expressed in Jubilees by saying that the author might be classified as a pietist. Surely we would like to know more about Jewish thought in antiquity than whether someone was in favor of or opposed to the reforms of Jason and Antiochus.

In the case of the Damascus Document and the broader question of Qumran origins we have a different set of problems. On one hand, the influence of Jubilees at Qumran is evident in the Damascus Document and the number of copies of Jubilees found at Qumran—not to mention pseudo-Jubilees documents and countless other parallels that can be explained as influence. On the other hand, the relationship is in one direction. The author of Jubilees exercised no long-term control over who could read the work. It seems safe to say the author of Jubilees would not have looked favorably on the separation of a group from the rest of Israel and the temple in Jerusalem (see Chapter 5).

A group can develop legal and interpretive changes over time (which may explain some non-parallels), but groups can also overlap or converge without sharing a continuous line of development. The issues that defined Jewish groups at the time of Jubilees may not have been the issues that defined groups later. The influence of Jubilees at Qumran is certainly worthy of study, as are their similarities and differences more broadly. Even if one accepts the possibility of direct social continuity between the author of Jubilees and the group described in the Damascus Document, the later developments of this group do not tell us about the literature and worldview of Jubilees at the time of composition.<sup>15</sup>

Also, it is worth being careful about identifying Qumran and “apocalyptic.” The sectarian writings do not use the genre. They were influenced by some apocalypses, but also by many non-apocalypses. The religio-social phenomenon “apocalypticism” seems to apply to the groups they describe, and some of the compositions reflect an apocalyptic worldview. However, religio-social phenomena can occur independently as a result of similar circumstances without direct causal continuity. It is not possible to make assertions about a single continuous apocalyptic movement based on bits of evidence from the Book of the Watchers through Qumran (or later).

Michel Testuz gives an early example of a study that finds too much similarity between Jubilees and the Damascus Document, other sectarian literature, and the later descriptions of the Essenes.<sup>16</sup> One problem is the extent to which expectations from other

---

<sup>15</sup> Segal, following Kister, comments on the probability that Jubilees was produced in the same stream of Judaism as the Qumran sect, after the formation of the Essene sect or stream. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 322. The term “stream” is appropriately vague, and fits the fact that the influence was in one direction. It is more difficult to establish that Jubilees comes after the rift. Jubilees is aware of a divide in Judaism in chapter 23, but does not approve of it. That divide is not necessarily the same as the one that distinguished the Essenes. Even if Jubilees takes positions that later became distinctive of the Essenes, it does not follow that Jubilees’ self-conception was sectarian in any way. See further Section 5.2.1.4 below.

<sup>16</sup> Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Genève: E. Droz, 1960), 179-195.

texts are extrapolated into Jubilees. For example, a single phrase (“elect of Israel”) becomes the basis for calling Jubilees the beginning of a separatist movement, contrary to the rest of the book. It seems Testuz reads Jubilees with the expectation that it would be like certain apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and sectarian documents. Another problem is that the parallels are not critically explained. There are indeed parallels between Jubilees and the sectarian documents, but continuous development of a single movement is only one explanation. Nevertheless, Testuz does note important differences in worldview that will be developed further below. For example, Testuz begins the chapter on eschatology with a warning, “Ensuite, les idées de notre auteur sur ce point sont assez différentes de l’enseignement des autres apocryphes ou pseudépigraphes, et il faut se garder d’introduire ici des notions empruntées ailleurs.”<sup>17</sup> Arguably, Testuz heeds this caution better in that chapter than in others, but a pattern of differences is not explored.

A later example of a study that overlooks differences in worldview in order to fit a hypothesis of sociological continuity is the work of Friedemann Schubert.<sup>18</sup> Schubert makes some key insights and had access to the distinctions and definitions worked out in the 1970s. Ultimately, however, speculation on the continuity of a movement pushes aside study of discontinuity in worldview. Schubert accepts the *Semeia* 14 definition and embraces temporarily Stegemann’s case for basing the discussion on works that use the literary genre (not the sectarian writings from Qumran).<sup>19</sup> Thus, he rightly concludes that

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 165.

<sup>18</sup> Friedemann Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung: Studien zum Jubiläenbuch und seinem Trägerkreis*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe III, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 771 (Frankfurt am Main; New York: Lang, 1998). Based on a 1996 dissertation at the University of Leipzig.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 75, 80.

Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse,” particularly in the framework (*Rahmen*).<sup>20</sup> Schubert also observes at least one difference from the level of worldview—that rewritten scripture is not the typical *Stoffe* of apocalypses.<sup>21</sup> This observation is an exception noted in a march to fit Jubilees in a comprehensive social theory of second temple Judaism. Drawing heavily from Hengel, Schubert places the Jubilees group in a continuous line of development that includes the circles that produced the Enochic apocalypses and the Qumran sectarians.<sup>22</sup>

In fairness to Schubert, his stated goal was to investigate the circles that produced and transmitted Jubilees,<sup>23</sup> and he may indeed have found the most plausible of the comprehensive theories available. Even if the continuity at the religio-social level is legitimate, it plows over discontinuities and diversity of thought along the way. If the author of Jubilees fits on a line of social continuity which connects the authors of the early Enochic apocalypses and Qumran origins, it must at least be admitted that this line arches over significant intellectual diversity. (There remains the problem that alleged

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 72.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 263. “Einerseits war dieser apokalyptische Grundzug des Jub festzustellen, andererseits zeigte sich aber, daß insbesondere das weitgehende Fehlen genuin apokalyptischer Stoffe und stattdessen die Wiedergabe des biblischen Erzählfadens gegen eine eindeutige Zuordnung des Jub zu apokalyptischen Schriften stand.” My translation, “On the one hand, this apocalyptic essential feature of Jubilees was determined, on the other hand it was shown that in particular the significant absence of genuine apocalyptic materials, and in their place the retelling of the biblical narrative, stood against a clear allocation of Jubilees to apocalyptic writings.”

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. “Aufgrund dieses Denkens, daß das Jub in seiner Konzeption mit anderen apokalyptischen Entwürfen verbindet, ist es m.E. berechtigt, das Jub als Apokalypse und seinen Trägerkreis als apokalyptisch geprägt—und zwar insbesondere durch die Henochtradition—zu bezeichnen.” My translation, “On the basis of this reckoning, that Jubilees connects with other apocalyptic sketches in its conceptual design, it is justified (in my opinion) to designate Jubilees as an apocalypse and its tradition circles apocalyptic-shaped, particularly through the Enoch tradition.” See pages 78-80 for Schubert’s adoption of Hengel’s model of development from the early apocalypses to Qumran.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 12.



intellectual continuity was the main basis for the hypothesis in the first place.) Schubert rightly observed that Jubilees does not have the *Stoffe* of the apocalypses in that one does not expect to find rewritten scripture in the framework of an apocalypse, but this is only a fraction of the differences in worldview. The present study intends to focus on the question of the worldview of Jubilees in relationship to other apocalypses. Since the literature is our main source of evidence, this sort of study should be considered logically prior to social theories. The conclusions of the present work will not rule out a broad evolutionary model of social continuity, but such a model, if it still seems probable, will be colored with significant “sibling” rivalry.

#### 1.4.3. Emphasis on issues other than worldview (the figure of Enoch and calendar)

There are two important issues in Jubilees that are sometimes given absolute status as determinative of the worldview of Jubilees. Jubilees develops the figure of Enoch and advocates a 364-day year. However, neither of these issues defines the apocalyptic worldview or the literary genre “apocalypse.”

Mention of the figure of Enoch—beyond what is said in Genesis—may create a literary association with the Enochic apocalypses, but this association is not an automatic, uncritical endorsement of every idea associated with Enoch. As elsewhere, we need to ask separately what is said about or by means of the shared literary features. The figure of Enoch is one of the features that hold together the early Enochic apocalypses, but the

figure was not limited to a single group, worldview, or genre.<sup>24</sup> Enoch later became a divisive figure in some circles, such that the figure could only be embraced or rejected, depending on social location and worldview far beyond the interpretation of Genesis 5:24.<sup>25</sup> For the time of Jubilees, three assumptions should be avoided. It should not be assumed that the figure of Enoch constituted an issue on which an author had to take sides. It should not be assumed that Jubilees was embracing a worldview by including the figure of Enoch in an expansion of Genesis. It should not be assumed that Jubilees was embracing a worldview (or a canon) by including some writings and traditions attributed to Enoch among the received writings and traditions of Israel.

It might be acceptable to use the adjective “Enochic” in connection with Jubilees if it meant only “making mention of the figure of Enoch,” “addressing issues sometimes associated with Enoch,” or even, “making some use of traditions associated with Enoch.” However, classification of Jubilees within Enochic Judaism implies assumptions about religio-social origins and worldview that are not consistent with the findings of the present work. Within this trend there are different perspectives and emphases as to the extent to which a single coherent worldview applies to all things “Enochic.” Gabriele Boccaccini finds the social and intellectual pre-history of Jubilees in Enochic Judaism,

---

<sup>24</sup> Sirach and Genesis are examples of texts that share the figure of Enoch, but not much of the genre, worldview or movement. The Danielic apocalypses are examples of texts that share the genre “apocalypse,” and much of the worldview, but not the figure of Enoch.

<sup>25</sup> The reticence toward Enoch is supported by Targum Onkelos on Genesis 5:24 (God killed him), and according to Ginzberg is true of Tannaitic and most Amoraic Rabbinic literature, although Himmelfarb calls for moderation. Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-1928), 5.163. Louis Ginzberg, “Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings,” *JBL* 41, no. 1-2 (1922): 115-136. Martha Himmelfarb, “A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature,” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13, no. 1 (1978): 259-269.

but counts Jubilees itself as a major development, particularly in subsuming the figure and revelation of Moses.<sup>26</sup> James Scott places Jubilees within the Enochic apocalyptic tradition and treats the Apocalypse of Weeks as presumed in Jubilees, but again some room for variation is permitted.<sup>27</sup> Helge Kvanvig emphasizes the centrality of Enoch in Jubilees, and situates Jubilees in a pattern far broader than the contemporary apocalypses.<sup>28</sup> Some broad patterns may be more helpful than others; the essential qualification is the possibility of heterodoxy in worldview even where other continuities exist. Jubilees is not pro-Enochic or anti-Enochic, but its worldview does differ from the worldview typically conveyed by the Enochic (and Danielic) apocalypses.

The second issue that encourages over-hasty assessment of the worldview of Jubilees is the issue of calendar. Judaism at the time of Jubilees cannot be neatly divided into two parties, two worldviews, two calendars. This is not the place to outline all the complexities of calendars in second century BCE Judaism; suffice it to say that sources could agree on a 364-day year and still disagree on calendrical details and emphases.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 87-89. In a more recent work Boccaccini further emphasizes the extent to which Jubilees is a new movement. Gabriele Boccaccini, "From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism: The Heavenly Tablets in Jubilees as the Foundation of a Competing Halakha," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

<sup>27</sup> "The Jubilean stream of Enochic apocalyptic tradition seems to have very different ideas about how history is constructed and where to put the focus." James M. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 91 (Boston: Brill, 2005), 132. The different idea here is whether the mid-point of history is the building or destruction of the first temple.

<sup>28</sup> Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988). Helge S. Kvanvig, "Jubilees—Between Enoch and Moses: A Narrative Reading," *JSJ* 35, no. 3 (2004): 243-261.

<sup>29</sup> The Astronomical Book and Jubilees both use a 364-day year, but they address different issues, and disagree on the substantial issue of whether lunar observations have any legitimacy. The author of

All the more so, sources could agree on a 364-day year and still disagree on significant matters of worldview.<sup>30</sup> Calendar helps with the classification of Jubilees in ancient Jewish thought and movements, but does not resolve the worldview conveyed by the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees. A certain view of history is part of the apocalyptic worldview—a certain calendar is not.

Friedemann Schubert uses the correlation between the calendars of Jubilees and the Astronomical Book to situate Jubilees in the Enochic tradition.<sup>31</sup> As discussed above, this is less of a problem in Schubert’s pursuit of the long-term social patterns that explain the background of Jubilees. However, this approach tends to ignore the subtleties of worldview, and contributes to the misconception that the social-circles described correspond to a strict and coherent ideology. The findings of the present work will help to disconfirm the assumption that alleged chronological similarities between Jubilees and the Apocalypse of Weeks point to a shared theology and unarticulated elaborate system

---

Jubilees is concerned to interpret Leviticus 25 in terms of the Exodus and return to the Land, and insists that a lunar calendar not be used for dating festivals. Still, Jubilees should not be counted as obsessed with all matters chronological. Besides the things that are not mentioned at all (days of the week, *mishmarot*), Jubilees 5:27 and references to the middle of the third month as the fifteenth (14:10; 15:1; 16:11, 12, 13) may point to lack of concern for clarity and consistency on the counting of the four intercalary days. Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of *Jubilees*,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming. For more ambitious theories that bring out problems and variations in the 364-day year calendars, see Leora Ravid, “The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar - A Reexamination,” *DSD* 10, no. 3 (2003): 371-394. Gabriele Boccaccini, “The Solar Calendars of Daniel and Enoch,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins, Peter W. Flint, and Cameron VanEpps, VT Sup 83 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2001), 311-328.

<sup>30</sup> There may be some connection between the condemnation in Daniel of Antiochus Epiphanes seeking to “change the times” (Daniel 7:25), and Jubilees warning of calendrical errors that will make a holy day profane and vice versa (Jubilees 6:37), but how much does this tell us about worldview? We should not ignore the ways in which Jubilees and Daniel are compatible, nor should we think that agreement on opposition to the festival calendar of Jason and Antiochus is bound with agreement on other matters.

<sup>31</sup> Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung*, 54-69.

of chronology. Fortunately, recent works are pointing to the diversity in details and concerns among texts that fit generally with the 364-day year.<sup>32</sup> An enriched understanding of the diversity of chronological thought will complement the present investigation into the diversity of thought on issues pertaining to the genre “apocalypse.”

Twentieth century scholarship brought great progress in the study of ancient texts as literature, but the above three impediments to understanding the worldview and use of the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees developed at the same time. In a sense, a more tenable position can be found in the first modern work on Jubilees, by August Dillmann.

Sowohl um dieser seiner form willen, als auch weil das buch an meheren stellen hinweisungen auf die fernere, sogar messianische Zukunft enthält, kann es allerdings mit den zahlreichen apokalyptischen erzeugnissen der letzten Jahrhunderte vor und der ersten nach Christus zusammengestellt werden, und erklärt sich auch daraus der zweite name des buches... ἡ τοῦ Μωυσέως ἀποκάλυψις. Auf der anderen seite aber ist es doch durch seinen inhalt und seine ganze art von den büchern, die wir jetzt Apokalypsen nennen, so verschieden, dass wir ihm jenen titel nicht wohl beilegen können...<sup>33</sup>

As we shall see, the contrast between form and contents lacks the precision of the contrast between literary genre and worldview, and the terminology is better tied to literary genre than conceptual contents. Nevertheless, this brief summary of the ways in

---

<sup>32</sup> Especially, Ben-Dov, “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of *Jubilees*,” forthcoming. See also, note 29 above.

<sup>33</sup> August Dillmann, “Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis,” *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 2-3 (1850-1851): 74. Cited in Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 25. My translation, “Both on account of its own form, and also in as much as the book in several places refers to the distant, even messianic, future, it can indeed be placed with the numerous apocalyptic witnesses of the last centuries before and the first after Christ; and the second name of the book, the Apocalypse of Moses, is clarified through this. On the other hand, however, it is, by its contents and the whole nature, so different from the books which we now call apocalypses that we can probably not give it that title.”

which Jubilees is typical and atypical among the apocalypses is virtually unsurpassed until now. By applying a rigorous set of distinctions it is possible to offer a clear and precise description of the literary relationship between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. We now turn to the history of scholarship on the genre of Jewish apocalyptic literature. We will pay particular attention to the development of the distinctions and definitions that make it possible to clarify the levels at which Jubilees is and is not like contemporary apocalypses. Jubilees clearly does use the literary genre “apocalypse,” but clearly does not convey the typical worldview.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE GENRE OF JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

The Greek word ἀποκάλυψις, “uncovering,” comes into English by way of the Apocalypse of John. The word “apocalyptic” is often used in English in a vague sense of, “similar to the Apocalypse of John.” Modern scholarship on Jewish apocalyptic literature largely developed from the perspective of formal and conceptual similarities with this particular text.<sup>1</sup> The focus on the Apocalypse of John is not due solely to its inclusion in the Western Christian canons. It is the earliest clear use of ἀποκάλυψις as a technical term for a type of literature, whether by the original author or shortly thereafter.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> James Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 58 (1975): 15. Paul D. Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*, ed. Keith R. Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 27, 29. Ironically, even the Apocalypse of John has not been immune to the question of whether it is “really” apocalyptic. Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 15 n. 2. Sacchi does not doubt the genre “apocalypse” or apocalyptic themes in the Apocalypse of John, but does exclude it from the apocalyptic tradition. Gabriele Boccaccini, “Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship,” in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium*, ed. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, JSPSup 9 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 38.

<sup>2</sup> See Smith and especially Adler for discussion of the Christian use of the technical term. It is not problematic that the early Christian usage was broader than all but the broadest modern usage, nor that we find no pre-Christian attempt to name the genre. Morton Smith, “On the History of Ἀποκαλυπτοῦ and Ἀποκάλυψις,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 9-20. William Adler, “Introduction,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 8-9.

“Apocalypse” is the most ancient term for the literary genre used by the Apocalypse of John and a good number of earlier and contemporary texts. Indeed, the opening of the Apocalypse of John introduces the basic issues that have concerned modern scholarship on the genre. In three verses one finds the basic framework of a revelation from God, through an angel, to a human scribe. The spatial axis is suggested by the journey of the angel, and the temporal axis by the nearness of the “appointed time.” More complicated issues, such as the function, social location, and esoteric readership and audience could be debated from these verses. The Apocalypse of John introduces but does not resolve these issues. Modern scholarship on the genre “apocalypse” attempts to define and describe what is typical of all the apocalypses in order to understand how the genre is used in any one apocalypse.

Two basic issues from the history of scholarship are essential for this dissertation. First, the literary genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview are distinct but related in that the apocalyptic worldview can be defined as the worldview typically conveyed by the apocalypses, and therefore suggested by the use of the genre. Second, the definition of the genre “apocalypse” in *Semeia* 14 accurately reflects a type of writing used by ancient authors. On both of these points there is a basis of solid agreement and a degree of continuing debate.

On the first point, scholars agree on the distinction but not always on the relationship between the genre and the worldview. For a long time, and for different reasons, scholars held the literary genre “apocalypse”, the apocalyptic worldview, and the socio-religious phenomenon of apocalypticism to be fundamentally co-incident. From this view, it would be impossible even to ask if Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” but does not convey the apocalyptic worldview. At the other extreme, if one holds the genre



and the worldview to be not only distinct but essentially unrelated then there would be no significance if Jubilees uses the genre but does not express the worldview. Thus, one might think that a non-apocalyptic apocalypse is no more surprising than an apocalyptic non-apocalypse (such as much of Paul and the War Scroll).

I claim that the use of the genre creates a reader expectation of the worldview, and an ironic discord when the reader expectation is inverted. It makes sense to define the apocalyptic worldview as the worldview *typically* conveyed by the apocalypses (even when found in works that do not use the genre). To omit the word “typically,” however, would amount to a denial of the possibility of irony in ancient literature. To a degree, the apocalyptic worldview must be conceived as a “big tent” in order to account for the breadth of ideas conveyed by the genre (especially diachronically). For that reason, I speak of the apocalyptic worldview as a cluster of compatible ideas. It remains for the rest of this dissertation to establish that Jubilees does, in fact, express ideas so much at odds with that cluster of ideas that no tent of the apocalyptic worldview could be so big without becoming the megaplex of common Judaism. It is essential for this chapter to establish a definition of the genre “apocalypse” that accounts both for the typical case (the genre expresses the worldview) and the possibility of irony (the genre creates an expectation of a worldview that is inverted).

On the second point, scholars agree that there is no better definition of the genre “apocalypse”, but still show hesitation on whether it should be viewed as a tool constructed by modern scholars, or as a tool used by ancient authors to convey meaning. It is true that no technical term existed for the genre at the time of Jubilees, but the

validity of the concept of genre does not depend on the naming thereof.<sup>3</sup> Even the question of whether the ancient author was conscious of the use of genre does not concern us here. Nor is it a problem if Jubilees uses more than one genre.<sup>4</sup> All theories of genre build on the fundamental insight that the composition of texts involves use of borrowed elements to convey meaning. Although one theory of genre or another might fail to explain the composition of texts in the second century BCE, the basic concept of genre cannot be dismissed as an anachronistic construct. Thus the question becomes whether the *Semeia* 14 definition is a good definition, such that it articulates patterns that already exist in the ancient texts. Although the history of scholarship has produced some helpful qualifications and caveats, this chapter seeks to show that the *Semeia* 14 definition is not only unsurpassed as a scholarly tool, but accurately defines a genre used by ancient authors. The literary definition of the genre does not tell us everything we would like to know about the intent of the author and the composition of the text, but the definition does allow us to make soundly one basic conclusion: Jubilees meets all the criteria of the definition of the genre “apocalypse,” therefore the book uses the genre.

The modern study of the relationship between genre and worldview in Jewish apocalyptic literature climaxed in the 1970s. A number of texts in the 1960s reflect increasing study, but generally raised more problems than solutions. Before 1960 apocalyptic literature was left vaguely defined according to lists of characteristics of a

---

<sup>3</sup> Klaus Koch made this point with an analogy from grammar. The validity of the category “piel” is not dependent on the naming of the concept. Klaus Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*, trans. S. M. Cupitt (New York, Scribner, 1969), 12.

<sup>4</sup> Scholars have long recognized cases of mixed genres, but I prefer to avoid any implication of exclusivity in genre. For that reason, I speak of works or passages making use of the genre “apocalypse,” rather than simply being apocalypses.

few “exemplary” apocalypses. A number of other issues came from around the 1960s, and influenced the quest for distinctions and definitions primarily by illustrating how inconsistently the terms had been used. In the following we will address the major issues thematically—chronological surveys exist elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> First we will consider the three-fold distinction, the factors that delayed and resisted it, its extreme application, and the case for a moderate relationship between the distinct elements. Then we will consider the possibility of defining the literary genre “apocalypse” morphologically, taking *Semeia* 14 as the center.

---

<sup>5</sup> Schmidt deals exhaustively with modern scholarship up to 1947 with attention to form-content distinctions. Johann Michael Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1969). Koch provides an excellent, however polemical, review of the maelstrom of conflicting interests from systematic theology, historical Jesus scholarship, and Old Testament scholarship. Koch’s work itself soon became a milestone in the history of scholarship. Klaus Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik. Eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970). English translation, Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Naperville: Allenson, 1972). Unfortunately, neither Schmidt nor Koch discusses the modern Jewish scholarship on the subject. It would fit well with Koch’s points to note that Ginzberg and Buber shared the negative assessment of apocalyptic, and as much as Christians tried to dismiss apocalyptic as a Jewish corruption of Early Christianity, contemporary Jewish scholars equally dismissed Apocalyptic as a foreign, marginal, sectarian apostasy from normative Judaism. Ginzberg, “Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings,” 115-136. Martin Buber, *Kampf um Israel: Reden und Schriften (1921-1932)* (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1933), 61-63. Barr gives an extended review of Koch with additional emphasis on English-language scholarship. Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 9-35. Hanson’s review reflects his interest in sociological study. Paul D. Hanson, “Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic,” in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, ed. Werner E. Lemke, Patrick D. Miller, and Frank Moore Cross (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 389-413. Sturm organizes his history of scholarship into studies primarily as a literary genre and primarily as a theological concept (his sympathies toward the latter). Richard E. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’: A Problem in Biblical Criticism,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, JSNTSup 24 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 17-48. Collins focuses on scholarship in a narrow, but important, range from 1979-1989. John J. Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium*, ed. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, JSPSup 9 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 11-32. Recently Lorenzo DiTommaso produced a lengthy review of scholarship since Collins’ previously mentioned 1991 article. DiTommaso refers extensively to older works in filling out the issues. Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 2 (2007): 235-286. Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 3 (2007): 367-432.

## 2.1. The relationship between morphological, conceptual, and sociological features

The distinction between the formal features of the genre “apocalypse” and the worldview typically conveyed thereby is foundational to this study. One frequently finds some distinction made between form and content, if only as a way of organizing a chapter that presumes their unity. Several earlier studies anticipate the foundation of the distinction, but Paul Hanson was the most influential in proposing not only that the genre “apocalypse,” apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism could be distinguished, but that they did not always overlap and could be studied separately. Previously, two major factors had inhibited the possibility of even asking the question if the genre “apocalypse” was used ironically to express an inversion of the apocalyptic worldview. First, from the beginning of modern study of the subject, “apocalyptic” was reified into a single coherent entity with the various manifestations showing different sides of the same literary, conceptual, and psycho-social monolith. Second, Hermann Gunkel promoted a way of studying *Gattung* that demanded the simultaneous study of elements from various levels of abstraction. This influenced an approach to “apocalyptic” as a *Gattung* that constitutes a single and distinctive combination of literary form, thought, and *Sitz im Leben*. New evidence (particularly the Scrolls) and new scholarship (Klaus Koch discusses developments in systematic theology and historical Jesus research as well as Old Testament scholarship) built on the weak foundation of a reified notion of “apocalyptic.” The resulting terminological chaos and logical desperation (described by Koch as *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*) in the 1960s prompted some extreme reactions in the 1970s, calling for a complete divorce of formal and conceptual elements. As understandable as this

reaction may have been under the circumstances, a moderate relationship can be maintained.

#### 2.1.1. The early form-content distinctions and the reification of apocalyptic

We should address from the outset the need to qualify any distinction between form and content. In *Semeia* 14, John Collins distinguishes form and content within the morphology of the literary genre. Specifically, the form is the narrative framework, and the content of the narrative framework is transcendence on the spatial and temporal axes. In a broader sense, the contrast between literary genre and worldview could be considered a contrast between form and content. One might think of form and content not as an absolute division, but as a spectrum from the most explicit and concrete elements to the most abstract and speculative. Thus, while spatial and temporal transcendence is more abstract than the narrative framework, it can be measured in explicit features of the texts, such as heavenly tablets, angelic liturgies, and judgment scenes. Theoretically one could contrast any two points along the spectrum as form and content. It will aid clarity, however, to limit the use of the terms to the narrower sense of form and content as components of literary genre. Most importantly, the contents of the literary genre should not be confused with the contents of the worldview.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Fletcher-Louis accuses the *Semeia* 14 of failing to stratify form and content. The criticism loses strength if we think of form and content as a continuum or a distinction that can be made on various levels. *Semeia* 14 does include the content of the revelation at the level of literary morphology, but not the theological or worldview contents. Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Jewish Apocalypticism," in *The Handbook of the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and T. Holmén (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

From the beginning of modern study on the subject, *Apokalyptik* was reified as a coherent entity. Although various distinctions between form and content were made in the course of organizing presentations, they were viewed as two sides of the same coin without seriously considering a complex relationship.<sup>7</sup> Strong generalizations were made based on a limited number of sources. Although one might expect to find a trend toward more qualified assertions or more thorough noting of exceptions as new texts became available, the monolithic view of “apocalyptic” survived through the 1960s partly by privileging some texts over others as “exemplary cases.”<sup>8</sup> As James Barr points out, many statements about “apocalyptic” were based on theological or philosophical constructs that could not be verified or falsified based on any ancient apocalypse, let alone a survey of all of them.<sup>9</sup>

Needless to say, Friedrich Lücke’s pioneering work in 1832 did not take into account all the evidence now available.<sup>10</sup> With the Apocalypse of John in the foreground, “apocalyptic” essentially became the background of everything literary and theological that the Apocalypse of John shares with other texts.<sup>11</sup> While a number of features may be

---

<sup>7</sup> Schmidt is particularly attentive to the distinction between form and content in nineteenth century scholarship. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*.

<sup>8</sup> See page 80 below for attempts to define the genre by exemplary cases.

<sup>9</sup> Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 30-31.

<sup>10</sup> Friedrich Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesamte apokalyptische Litteratur*, Kommentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes (Bonn: Bey Eduard Weber, 1832). Friedrich Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes: oder, Allgemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes insbesondere*, 2. verm. und verb. Aufl. ed., Kommentar über die Schriften des Evang. Johannes (Bonn: Weber, 1852). See Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*.

<sup>11</sup> Richard Sturm organizes his history of scholarship into scholarship on apocalyptic as a literary genre and as a theological concept. He puts Lücke in a class by himself, noting that Lücke intends to do both (though fundamentally a more literary approach). It might be better stated that Lücke made no such distinction. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 19.

“generic” (in the sense of typical or borrowed) in the Apocalypse of John, if one wishes to say what is true for *all* the apocalypses, one can in fact say rather little. The problem developed as scholars made the otherwise laudable move of studying the apocalypses in their own right, yet made even more specific and bold claims about “apocalyptic” as the historical bridge between Old Testament prophecy and Christianity. Sturm says of Adolf Hilgenfeld,<sup>12</sup> “He thus wants to consider ‘Jewish apocalyptic’ as an historical entity in and of itself, including canonical and non-canonical works, both to be valued equally.”<sup>13</sup> The assumption of the existence of such a coherent historical entity pervades the history of scholarship through the 1960s. While Lücke’s title spoke of “apokalyptische Litteratur,” Hilgenfeld’s title makes clear his presumption of single coherent historical entity, “Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung.” Although the use of “apocalyptic” as a substantive is grammatically acceptable and potentially usable on a very abstract level for that which relates to the apocalypses in some way, the substantive became a symbol of the reification of a coherent historical entity.<sup>14</sup>

Johann Michael Schmidt’s survey of scholarship on Jewish apocalyptic makes a point of noting various form-content distinctions.<sup>15</sup> He considers Johann Gottfried Herder

---

<sup>12</sup> Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christenthums. Nebst einem Anhang über das gnostische System des Basilides* (Jena: Mauke, 1857; reprint, Amsterdam: Rodopi 1966).

<sup>13</sup> Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 20.

<sup>14</sup> For example, Adela Yarbro Collins criticizes Rowland’s, *The Open Heaven* for using the substantive, “It is hard to understand how, after the helpful work in this regard of P. Hanson and M. Stone, any specialist on this subject can still use the adjective ‘apocalyptic’ as a noun.” Adela Yarbro Collins, “Review of *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* by Christopher Rowland,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 465.

<sup>15</sup> He sees the *Gattung*-historical approach as a wheel that was re-invented in the history of scholarship. This kind of redundancy demands the book-length history of scholarship he provides. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 306-307.

(1744-1803) the forerunner of the study of the forms of the apocalypses, although not at all in the same way as what was carried out in the 1970s, after Schmidt's survey was written.<sup>16</sup> One finds in the two editions of Emil Schürer's master work an early struggle with the problems that led to the distinction between the genre "apocalypse" and the apocalyptic worldview.<sup>17</sup> While the 1874 version devoted a section to *Apokalyptik*, the 1886 version split the material into two sections. One deals with the conceptual aspects under the heading "die messianische Hoffnung," the other with the literary aspects under the heading, "prophetischen Pseudepigraphen."<sup>18</sup> Schmidt credits Schürer as the first to reserve the term "apocalyptic" for a literary form, separate from theological dogma.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, neither the terminological nor the conceptual distinction between literary form and worldview took hold.

Another important distinction can be found, though not thoroughly developed, in H. H. Rowley's lectures given in 1942 and first published in 1944 as *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*.<sup>20</sup> First, he distinguishes apocalyptic literature from apocalyptic eschatology, which is the subset of eschatology that is typically found in apocalypses. More

---

<sup>16</sup> "Form und Inhalt werden geschieden, um mit der Form nicht auch den Inhalt dieses ntl. Buchs an das Judentum zu verlieren. Was aber sind die Kriterien für diese Scheidung? Herder selbst bahnte trotz einiger mißverständener Äußerungen der Ansicht den Weg, daß in der Ap. Johs. eine allgemeine christliche Wahrheit in ein zeitbedingtes Gewand gehüllt worden sei." Ibid., 92.

<sup>17</sup> Emil Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1874). Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 2. neubearb. Aufl. des Lehrbuchs der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte ed. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886).

<sup>18</sup> Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 174. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 37. Barr, "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study," 15 n. 1. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic'," 20-21.

<sup>19</sup> "Schürer den Begriff 'apokalyptisch' seit der 2. Aufl. seines gen. Werks für die Bezeichnung allein der literarischen Form jener Inhalte reserviert." Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 174.

<sup>20</sup> H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*, New and revised 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Greenwood, NC: Attic Press, 1980).



importantly, he notes, “the ideas of apocalyptic eschatology may be found in works that could not be described as apocalypses.”<sup>21</sup> He seems further to suggest that the description of apocalyptic eschatology should be based only on apocalyptic literature, and extended to other genres only to the extent to which they reflect influence from the ideas found in the apocalypses.<sup>22</sup> Again, however, the proposal did not take hold, and not until Klaus Koch, followed particularly by John Collins, will one find a thorough attempt at precise terminology that grounds assertions about apocalyptic theology in the texts which use the literary genre.

Following a number of significant developments such as the publication of the first Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>23</sup> and developments in systematic theology and historical Jesus research,<sup>24</sup> increased attention was paid in the 1960s to the study of apocalyptic literature and theology. Two works from this decade by Philipp Vielhauer and D. S. Russell stand out for a number of important distinctions and insights, and yet were crippled by a flawed view of “apocalyptic” as a coherent entity.<sup>25</sup> Both distinguish literary and conceptual characteristics at some level, at least as a means of organizing the discussion, but essentially treat them as two aspects of the same whole.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>22</sup> “[The Pauline writings] have no place in a study of apocalyptic literature, though they have a place in the study of the influence of apocalyptic literature on the current of the Church’s thought.” Ibid. Sturm, who favors thinking of “apocalyptic” as a theological concept in the study of Pauline writings, discusses Rowley. Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 22.

<sup>23</sup> One major problem posed by the sectarian documents in particular is taken up below under “Paul Hanson’s separation...” (page 57).

<sup>24</sup> See especially, Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*.

<sup>25</sup> Philipp Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” in *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 581-607. Russell, *Method & Message*.

Vielhauer distinguishes the literary character, the world of ideas, and the origins of “apocalyptic” as separate sections, but still holds a reified concept of “apocalyptic” as a single coherent entity, and overestimates the degree to which a single essential literary character, set of ideas, and social origin can account for all the apocalypses. We shall return to the assertion of the inter-connectedness of literary, conceptual, and social elements in the following section on Hermann Gunkel’s theory of *Gattung*. Vielhauer distinguishes, but does not separate the genre and the worldview,

By means of the word “Apocalyptic” we designate first of all the literary genre of the Apocalypses, i.e. revelatory writings which disclose the secrets of the beyond and especially of the end time, and then secondly, the realm of ideas from which this literature originates.<sup>26</sup>

By the words “first” and “secondly” Vielhauer does *not* indicate importance or logical priority.<sup>27</sup> Rather he tends to reconstruct a monolithic world of ideas of which we only get occasional hints in the preserved texts. For example, Vielhauer begins the section “The Doctrine of Two Ages,” by saying, “The essential feature of Apocalyptic is its dualism.”<sup>28</sup> He admits that the so-called “doctrine” is not explicitly stated before 4 Ezra, but the problem is not so much whether variations on dualism are an important characteristic of the apocalyptic worldview, but whether “apocalyptic” is an entity that can be defined by doctrines and essential ideological features with only secondary recourse to preserved texts. Like Russell, Vielhauer tends to follow an assertion of what

---

<sup>26</sup> Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 582.

<sup>27</sup> Similarly, the acknowledgment of a distinction between literary type and theological province by Cullmann should not be mistaken for a methodological hierarchy. Oscar Cullmann, *Heil als Geschichte: heilsgeschichtliche Existenz im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1965). Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, 1st American ed. (New York,: Harper & Row, 1967).

<sup>28</sup> Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 588.

“the apocalypticist” thought with a single reference to 4 Ezra.<sup>29</sup> The possibility that post-second temple apocalypses vary considerably from earlier apocalypses is not adequately considered. In fairness to Vielhauer, he does include “lack of uniformity” in the details as a major characteristic of the apocalyptic worldview, although only after making some bold claims about the “basic character of Jewish apocalyptic.”<sup>30</sup> Here he says, “the world of ideas of Apocalyptic is uniform only in its basic structure, but lacks that uniformity and harmony in its expressions.” This important qualification notwithstanding, he finds too much uniformity and ascribes too little significance to the variety of expression.<sup>31</sup>

D. S. Russell also deserves credit for making some important observations and distinctions. The reified concept of apocalyptic literature and thought discussed with respect to Vielhauer applies similarly to Russell. Russell underestimates chronological variation and overestimates the extent to which a single phenomenon stands behind the various manifestations of apocalyptic. For example, Russell presumes a coherent angelic sin myth with Jubilees just filling in some gaps that went without saying in the Book of the Watchers.<sup>32</sup> As we shall see, the significant degree of variation should prohibit such an assumption. Since much of the confusion climaxing in the 1960s was of a terminological nature, we should also point out that Russell does not propose a rigorous definition *per se*. (We shall consider below the attempts to “define” the apocalypses with

---

<sup>29</sup> For example, in explaining why the “apocalypticists” used elements such as pseudepigraphy and future-form history Vielhauer presumes that a basic motivation and thought can be ascribed to every apocalyptic writer. *Ibid.*, 586.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 594.

<sup>31</sup> For further discussion of Vielhauer’s reified concept of apocalyptic, see Adler, “Introduction,” 2-7.

<sup>32</sup> Russell, *Method & Message*, 250.

lists of descriptive characteristics.) Thus, to take another example from our topic of interest, Russell states, “Jubilees is not, strictly speaking, an apocalyptic book,” but he does not speak strictly of what makes a work an apocalypse or an apocalyptic book.<sup>33</sup> Since Jubilees uses “apocalypse” among other genres, but does not share the apocalyptic worldview, the reified view of “apocalyptic” was incapable of describing Jubilees precisely. Simply put, Russell’s title reveals the basic limitation of the work, “The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic.” Although some distinction is drawn between method (roughly, literary devices) and message (roughly, theological concepts), “apocalyptic” is still a singular noun for a reified entity that has a singular method and message.

Following the terminological inconsistency and the conceptual confusion climaxing in the 1960s, Klaus Koch facilitated the division of intellectual history into decades by publishing his tide-turning polemic, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*, in 1970,<sup>34</sup> as did all those who completed or published their work in 1979.<sup>35</sup> Koch does not so much propose a more systematic program, but attempts to stir controversy and “expose the present state of affairs as untenable and to provoke its amendment, even if it is by way of contradiction.”<sup>36</sup> Koch succeeded in influencing subsequent scholars not just because of his critique within the disciplines of Old Testament scholarship (broadly defined beyond

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 54.

<sup>34</sup> Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*.

<sup>35</sup> Especially the SBL Genres Project in *Semeia* 14 (1975-1978, published in 1979), Jean Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalypique: son emploi à Qumrân,” *RdQ* 10, no. 1 (1979): 3-33. (published 1979 with a post-script on *Semeia* 14), the Uppsala conference (August 1979, published 1983), and Rowland’s *The Open Heaven* (completed January 1979, published 1982).

<sup>36</sup> Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 12.

the canon), historical Jesus scholarship, and systematic theology, but by illustrating the fundamental disconnect between them. Koch called for consistent terminology and a more rigorous foundation for theology in the historical-critical study of texts. As we shall see, his own proposal toward a definition resembles the previous attempts to define with lists of optional characteristics, even if he does go further than Vielhauer with the distinction between literary and conceptual features. Perhaps most significantly for our study, Koch proposed that a rigorous consideration must begin with a typology of a set of texts defined by formal criteria (although the formal criterion of composition in Hebrew or Aramaic turned out not to be helpful). Only on the basis of a defined set of texts could the common characteristics properly be called “apocalyptic.”

Was an diesen Schriften apokalyptisch ist, läßt sich nur erheben, wenn gemeinsame Gattungsmerkmale aufzuweisen sind. Wenn es überhaupt gelingen soll, einen verbindlichen Begriff von Apokalyptik in Zukunft zugewinnen, ist die form-, literatur- und sprachgeschichtliche Ausgangsposition nach Lage der Dinge die einzig mögliche.<sup>37</sup>

Koch’s proposal of grounding assertions about the *Gattung* characteristics of “apocalyptic” in a typology of a formally defined set of texts is of crucial significance for the history of scholarship, but is most potent in combination with Hanson’s loosening of the association of literary forms, conceptual features, and sociological background. In effect, this is a challenge to the very notion of *Gattung* as developed by Hermann Gunkel and an assertion that the apocalypses could be defined as a literary genre without reference to the worldview they convey or the *Sitz im Leben* from which they arise.

---

<sup>37</sup> Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik*, 20. Translated by Kohl, “We can only ascertain what is apocalyptic about these writings if characteristics common to the type can be demonstrated. If we are to succeed at all in the future in arriving at a binding definition of apocalyptic, a starting point in form criticism and literary and linguistic history is, in the nature of things, the only one possible.” Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 23.

Before continuing on with the contributions of Hanson, Stone, Barr, and Collins in the 1970s, we should look more closely at the theory of *Gattung* from which they diverge. The reification of “apocalyptic,” more often assumed than argued,<sup>38</sup> hindered the development of the distinctions that make it possible to ask how the genre is used in the Book of Jubilees. No less significant, however, was the active assertion that literature should be studied as an indivisible compound of formal, conceptual and social attributes. It is important to review the proper application of Gunkel’s method and the critiques that led to theories of genre better suited to complex literary compositions such as Jubilees.

#### 2.1.2. Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung* and the concept of genre promoted in the 1970s

Hermann Gunkel’s influence on the historical critical study of ancient texts is far-reaching,<sup>39</sup> but in this section we are concerned with his understanding of *Gattung*, and how it differs from the concept of literary genre used in *Semeia* 14 and in this study. First, we will attempt to clarify the terminology of the German terms *Gattungsgeschichte* and *Formgeschichte*, and similarly *Gattungen* and *Formen*. Then we will consider Gunkel’s assertion of the inseparable unity of the small form, the conceptual content, and the *Sitz im Leben* in the study of a *Gattung*. We should also note Gunkel’s emphasis on

---

<sup>38</sup> Schmithals argued what many had assumed, that “apocalyptic is a relatively closed, cohesive, and independent religious phenomenon.” Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement, Introduction & Interpretation*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 30. He explicitly focuses on “the unitary character of apocalyptic piety” while disregarding the possibility of development or local forms (page 212), and rejects the logic of starting with the historical texts and building the theological concept thereon (page 188).

<sup>39</sup> Hanson and Collins emphasize his contribution to the multivalent understanding of myth and the use of antecedent myth. Hanson, “Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic,” 393-396. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 16ff. See further Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalypik*, 195-204.

the diachronic study of *Gattungen*, and the possibility of sequential study in the larger project of *Literaturgeschichte*. Rather than attempting a thorough critique of the benefits and difficulties of Gunkel's method, we will focus on three features of Gunkel's concept of *Gattung* that complicate its applicability to apocalypses. Finally, we will consider some critiques of form-criticism that effectively describe a concept of literary genre very different from Gunkel's concept of *Gattung*.

Unfortunately, no consistent distinction is maintained between *Gattungsgeschichte* and *Formgeschichte*. *Gattungen* and *Formen* are sometimes interchanged, or *Formen* are treated as a subset of *Gattungen*, along with elements of conceptual contents and *Sitz im Leben*. In his earlier works Gunkel used the term *Gattungsforschung*. Dibelius introduced the term *Formgeschichte* in 1919 for essentially the same method.<sup>40</sup> *Formgeschichte* became the dominant term for the method developed largely by Gunkel,<sup>41</sup> despite Gunkel's own reservations.<sup>42</sup> "Form criticism" became the typical way of referring to Gunkel's method in English, and does not imply a rejection of Gunkel's emphasis on historical development (*Geschichte*). Koch writes, "So nützlich die

---

<sup>40</sup> Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 3. The original German edition should also be consulted, particularly for technical terminology that does not easily translate. The book was written and translated as an introduction for students, and hence takes liberties such as deleting or replacing references to untranslated German works. Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1964).

<sup>41</sup> Koch also notes Gressmann's contributions, and Gunkel's often noted dependence on his predecessors decades earlier. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 14. Schmidt finds predecessors of the *Gattung*-historical approach in the 18<sup>th</sup> century in Herder and Eichorn. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 173, 307.

<sup>42</sup> Buss explains Gunkel's reservations about the term, since it can connote concrete phenomena or holistic structures. Gunkel viewed the external linguistic forms as components of a *Gattung*, but accepted the term in the holistic, organic sense. Martin J. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, JSOTSup 274 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 248. See also, Erhard Blum, "Formgeschichte—A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 33.

Unterscheidung von Formeln und Gattungen ist, so sinnlos ist andererseits das Nebeneinander von ‘Formen und Gattungen.’”<sup>43</sup> In a more moderate vein, Koch quotes Dupont on the French equivalents,

Il n’y a pas de distinction adéquate entre ‘forme’ et ‘genre littéraire.’ La seule différence est qu’une ‘forme’ désigne un moyen d’expression concret, une formule plus ou moins fixée par l’usage, tandis qu’un genre littéraire se caractérise par un certain nombre de ces moyens d’expression.<sup>44</sup>

This relationship of *forme* as a component of *genre littéraire* is often found in German also, as Koch suggests, “Die bloße ‘Formensprache’ allein macht noch keine Gattung. Es gehört dazu immer ein gemeinsamer ‘Schatz von Gedanken und Stimmungen.’”<sup>45</sup> Thus, whether the term *Form* is used as a synonym for *Gattung*, or as an element of *Gattung* along with contents and social function, we come to the most significant claim of Gunkel for this study, the inseparability of the study of the three elements of *Gattung*.

Although there is some variety in how the elements are described by Gunkel and his followers, and some variety in how strongly the inseparability is stated, it is usually stated strongly enough that micro-forms, conceptual contents, and social function must be

---

<sup>43</sup> Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 6 n. 5. Translated by Cupitt, “Though the difference between formulas and types is an important one, it is useless to try to differentiate between ‘type’ (*Gattung*) and ‘form’ (*Form*).” Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 5 n. 5. Hartman also notes the tendency to use *Form* and *Gattung* interchangeably. Lars Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 330.

<sup>44</sup> Dupont *Les Béatitudes* 1954 p. 20f, in Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 6 n. 5. Translated by Cupitt, “There is no adequate distinction between ‘form’ and ‘literary type.’ The only difference is that form designates a means of concrete expression, a formula of style that is more or less fixed through usage, whereas a type is characterized by a certain number of these means of expression.”

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 5. Translated by Cupitt, “The mere type of language used is insufficient to constitute a literary type. Besides there must be a common ‘fund of thoughts and feelings.’”



studied inseparably together.<sup>46</sup> As we shall see, the issue for us is not whether each should be studied, but whether it is possible or necessary to understand one first, and then the others in light of the first. Gunkel describes the three elements of *Gattung* in a letter to Adolf Jülicher in 1925, “‘Gattungen’ stelle ich fest a) nach dem gemeinsamen Schatz von Gedanken u[nd] Stimmungen, b) nach dem gleich Sitz im Leben, c) nach gleichbleibenden Ausdrucksformen.”<sup>47</sup> Gunkel states the requirement of considering the three elements together in 1924, “Nur, wo wir alle drei Merkmale zusammen gewahren, wo wir also feststellen können, daß bestimmte Gedanken in bestimmter Form bei bestimmter Gelegenheit ausgesprochen werden, haben wir das Recht, von einer Gattung zu reden.”<sup>48</sup> One should also note the resemblance of these coincident elements to Hanson’s distinct categories of genre (*Formen*), eschatology / worldview (*Gedanken*), and the religio-social phenomenon (*Sitz im Leben*).<sup>49</sup> Gunkel went beyond asserting that the three basic elements should all be considered, to asserting that they could only be

---

<sup>46</sup> According to Buss, Gunkel systematized the three-part understanding of *Gattung* beginning in 1921, while writings in 1906 and 1917 point in that direction. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 247. Buss calls the three-part view of *Gattung*, “Gunkel’s most important contribution.” Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 259.

<sup>47</sup> Hans Rollmann, “Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode,” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78, no. 3 (1981): 284. Translated by Hayes 1980 *An Introduction to Old Testament Study*, pp. 127-128, “Genres I establish a) according to the common store of thoughts and moods, b) according to the similar Sitz im Leben, c) according to the constant forms of expression.”

<sup>48</sup> Hermann Gunkel, “Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag,” *ZAW* 42 (1924): 183. “Only where we encounter all three characteristics together, where we can ascertain thus, that certain thoughts were spoken in a certain form on a certain occasion, have we the right to speak of a *Gattung*.”

<sup>49</sup> Koch notes that, “der Begriff Stimmung bedeutet in den ersten Jahrzehnten unseres Jahrhunderts meist ‘Stimmung der Situation’ und weniger einen psychologischen Zustand im engeren Sinn.” Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 37 n. 18. Cupitt translates, “the word ‘mood’ (*Stimmung*) was usually used in the first decades of this century to mean only the ‘mood of the situation’, rather than a psychological condition in the narrow sense.” For more on Gunkel’s notion of *Sitz im Leben*, see Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 234-238.

considered together, “zu gleicher Zeit.”<sup>50</sup> Gunkel himself did not elaborate on the *Gattung* of the apocalypses in particular,<sup>51</sup> but his influence can clearly be seen in those who insist that the apocalypses cannot be conceived or defined apart from their *Sitz im Leben*.

Before proceeding with some of the problems of applying Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung* to the apocalypses, we should point out some further influential aspects of Gunkel’s program. First, Gunkel emphasized the diachronic study of *Gattungen*. That much is certainly proper, particularly in as much as *Sitze im Leben* change. As we shall discuss below (p. 103), however, Gunkel’s insight does not exclude the possibility of defining explicit literary types (genre in the sense used in *Semeia* 14) on a phenomenological basis. The need for diachronic study of *Gattungen* leads us to another point from Gunkel’s program. Although he emphasized the inseparability of the elements of *Gattungen*, he did recognize the need for some separation and sequence in the broader study of literature. As Koch phrases it, “Jeder Exegt muß deshalb, sobald er die Gattung seines Textes festgestellt hat, auch nach der Gattungsgeschichte fragen.”<sup>52</sup> Diachronic

---

<sup>50</sup> Gunkel 1925, quoted in Rollmann, “Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode,” 284 n. 16. Koch commented, “Der Brückenschlag von der Gattungsbeobachtung zum Sitz im Leben war ein genialer Einfall Gunkels.” Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*, 2., durchgängig überarb. Aufl. ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1967), 47. Translated by Cupitt, “It was Gunkel who had the genius to perceive that one cannot usefully study a particular literary type without at the same time taking account of its proper setting in life.” Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 37. See also Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 248-249.

<sup>51</sup> Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 218, 220. Gunkel comments on a history of religions methodology for interpreting the Apocalypse of John in *Schöpfung und Chaos*, but not *Gattungsgeschichte* in particular. Hermann Gunkel and Heinrich Zimmern, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895), 207-208.

<sup>52</sup> Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Second Edition*, 25. Cupitt translates, “Thus, as soon as the literary type of the text has been established, the exegete must turn to the history of the literary type.” Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 20.

study is necessary as following from, not preliminary to, identification of types. Further, as inclusive as Gunkel's concept of *Gattung* may be, his total desiderata for the study of literature is appropriately longer. "Solche Untersuchung der Gattungen aber wird erst dann Literaturgeschichte, wenn man versucht, die Geschichte zu erkennen, welche die Gattungen erlebt haben."<sup>53</sup> The distinction between literary history and the study of *Gattungen* can be understood as the distinction between everything we would eventually like to know about literature, and the minimal requirements for the first step of identification.

We should consider three factors that complicate the application of Gunkel's concept of *Gattung* to the apocalypses: the smaller size of unit conceived by Gunkel, his focus on the oral stage, and direct relationship between form and *Sitz im Leben*. We will also consider Koch's helpful distinction between *Rahmengattung* and *Gliedgattungen*. Then, in the critiques of Knierim and Doty we will find not so much a refutation of Gunkel in his own terms, but clear evidence that Gunkel's *Gattung* and Doty's "genre" (including also *Semeia* 14 and this study) are very different concepts. "Apocalypse" can be understood as a genre or perhaps a *Rahmengattung*, but not a *Gattung*.

First, Gunkel developed his notion of *Gattung* in reference to smaller units, such as the Decalogue and the Beatitudes, with the presumption that they could be understood in a setting independent of the literary context in which they are now embedded.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Hermann Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 33. Reprint of *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 27 1906, columns 1787-1800, 1861-1866. Translated in, Hermann Gunkel, "Problems of Hebrew Literary History," in *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, ed. Alexander Kennedy Dallas (New York: Macmillan, 1928), 61. "This study of the literary types, however, will only merit the name of Literary History when it attempts to get at the history through which these types have passed."

<sup>54</sup> See especially Blum, "Forgeschichte—A Misleading Category?," 36-38.

Gunkel was of course aware of the significance of the redaction process and how settings change with time and editing. His primary interest, however, lay in the original setting that caused a specific discrete unit to be used. To refer to the differences in scope, Koch distinguished between *Rahmengattung* and *Gliedgattung*. Gunkel's focus on the original, smaller unit of the *Gattung* corresponds more with the *Gliedgattung* than the *Rahmengattung*. According to Koch,

Das Problem von Glied- und Rahmengattung ist in der formgeschichtlichen Arbeit bisher vernachlässigt worden. Gunkel hat es nur bei den kultischen Liturgien und bei den Sagenkränzen gesehen und behandelt. In beiden Fällen gab er die Entstehung einer umfassenderen Gattung für einen zeitlich sehr späten Vorgang aus.<sup>55</sup>

Dibelius states the limitation succinctly,

Die Formgeschichte hat es bekanntlich nicht mit den abgeschlossenen literarischen Werken zu tun, sondern mit den kleinen Einheiten, die in mündlicher oder schriftlicher Ueberlieferung weitergegeben werden, deren Kenntnis wir aber freilich aus Büchern schöpfen, in die sie Aufnahme gefunden haben.<sup>56</sup>

As we shall see, the intimate relationship of form and social setting breaks down in larger works of "literary" rather than oral composition. The distinctive formal elements of the apocalypses are to be found in the narrative framework.

---

<sup>55</sup> Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Second Edition*, 31. Translated by Cupitt, "The problem presented by component and complex literary types has been neglected hitherto in form-critical work. Gunkel dealt with it only in connection with cultic liturgies and collections of sagas. In both cases he asserted that the development of more complex types was a very late occurrence." Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 24.

<sup>56</sup> Martin Dibelius, "Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien," *Theologische Rundschau* N. F. 1 (1929): 187. Quoted by Koch and translated by Cupitt, "It is a recognized fact that form criticism is not concerned with complete works of literature as such but with small units which are handed down orally or in writing, though of course we derive our knowledge of these from the books into which they have been absorbed." Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 25.

Similarly, in pushing backwards toward the original setting of smaller and older units, Gunkel was on solid ground in conceiving of the *Sitz im Leben* as some variation of oral composition and transmission. According to Koch, quoting Gunkel,

Gunkel wollte freilich vom Sitz im Leben nur bei mündlichen Gattungen reden. Er meinte, daß die Gattungen diesen Mutterboden “in entwickelterer Zeit, als die Schrift zur Herrschaft über das geistige Leben emporstieg ... zu Gunsten des geschriebenen Buches mehr oder weniger aufgegeben haben.”<sup>57</sup>

Genre, for the present study, is found in the narrative framework of written works.<sup>58</sup> A study of the smaller oral units behind the apocalypses as we have them would certainly be valid, but none of those smaller oral units could be appropriately called apocalypses in anything like the sense we use. The problems of applying Gunkel’s notion of *Gattung* to the apocalypses do not undermine his original project. Gunkel himself did not develop specific claims about *Apokalyptik* as a *Gattung*. We should, however, take these problems into account when we encounter other scholars whose treatment of apocalypses and “apocalyptic” is dependent on Gunkel’s program.

---

<sup>57</sup> Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? First Edition*, 31 n. 2. Gunkel, “Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag,” 183. Translated by Cupitt, “Gunkel wanted to speak of settings in life only in connection with *oral* literary types. It was his opinion that literary types to some extent lost their link with their parent soil, for as ‘in the course of time they developed and writing won a dominating position in intellectual life, they gave up their original setting in life in favour of that of the written book.’” See also Buss’ discussion of Gunkel’s contrast between the purity of oral forms and the deviations and mixtures introduced by writers aiming for clever effects. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 236. Consistent with his times, Gunkel attached a value judgment to pure/oral over mixed/written. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 254.

<sup>58</sup> William G. Doty, “The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis,” in *The Society of Biblical Literature, One Hundred Eighth Annual Meeting Book of Seminar Papers*, ed. Lane C. McGaughey (Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 424. Rolf Knierim, “Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered,” *Interpretation* 27, no. 4 (1973): 444. Eibert Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*, Oudtestamentische studiën 35 (New York: Brill, 1996), 4.

Finally, along the same lines, Gunkel's understanding of the close relationship between *Sitz im Leben* and smaller oral forms does not translate easily to a *Sitz im Leben* of a larger literary apocalypse as a whole. Alt elaborates that Gunkel's method,

beruht auf der Einsicht, daß in jeder einzelnen Literaturgattung... bestimmte Inhalte mit bestimmten Ausdrucksformen fest verbunden und daß diese charakteristischen Verbindungen nicht etwa erst von Schriftstellern nachträglich und willkürlich den Stoffen aufgeprägt sind, sondern von jeher, also auch schon in der Frühzeit volksmäßiger mündlicher Gestaltung und Überlieferung vor aller Literatur, wesentlich zusammengehörten, da sie den besonderen, regelmäßig wiederkehrenden Ereignissen und Bedürfnissen des Lebens entsprachen, aus denen die Gattungen je für sich erwuchsen.<sup>59</sup>

The question for us is not whether the relationship between *Sitze im Leben* and *Formen* works for smaller oral units in the Tetrateuch, but whether the same logic should lead to the conclusion that the apocalypses all arise from a certain *Sitz im Leben*. As Knierim points out, the precise *Sitz im Leben* of a literary, as opposed to oral, genre is simply the situation of the writing.<sup>60</sup> The claim of organic unity between the *Sitz im Leben* and the manner of expression becomes vastly more complicated when one turns to the apocalypses, a point not lost even on those who seek such a dimension to a definition of the genre.<sup>61</sup> For any one apocalypse the scholar must usually wander from the explicit features into hypothetical reconstruction to argue for a particular *Sitz im Leben*. To claim

---

<sup>59</sup> Albrecht Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3 vols. (München: Beck, 1959), 1.284f. Quoted and translated in Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 27., "...rests on the assumption that each individual literary type... has a particular content and particular forms of expression, and that these two are closely connected. This is not the result of any arbitrary linking up on the part of the writers, but the two were linked right from the start. That is to say that even in primitive times material was shaped and handed down orally by the people generally, so that these forms correspond with the regularly recurring events and needs of a particular way of life, out of which the literary types arose naturally."

<sup>60</sup> Knierim, "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered," 444.

<sup>61</sup> David E. Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 80.

that any one *Sitz im Leben* produced *all* the apocalypses, and in that sense is generic, would strain credulity and mangle the concrete sense of *Sitz im Leben* used by Gunkel. When we turn to Jubilees, even the distinction between *Rahmengattung* and *Gliedgattung* is not adequate since a work in general, and Jubilees in particular, need not make use of only one *Rahmengattung*. Even if one accepts the correspondence of a *Gliedgattung* to a particular *Sitz im Leben*, a larger literary work not only has multiple *Gliedgattungen*, but can make use of multiple *Rahmengattungen*. It is consequently impossible to speak of the *Sitz im Leben* of a work like Jubilees in the generative sense used by Gunkel.

When Koch speaks of a *Rahmengattung* we already find a significant change from Gunkel's concept of *Gattung*.<sup>62</sup> As we move on to consider the critiques of Knierim and Doty, we should think of "genre" in a new sense, rather than a translation and revision of *Gattung*. Doty and Knierim both speak of genre in general, not in specific connection to the apocalypses. As we shall see, apocalypses can be defined as a literary genre in this sense. Collins cites Doty in *Semeia* 14, and Sanders also perceives the radical difference between *Gattung* and genre in the sense of Doty, Collins and so forth.<sup>63</sup> Knierim and Doty both develop a larger sense of genre as that which is "typical" or borrowed in a work as a whole. The typical elements in the larger sense can occur at any level of abstraction. Knierim starts generally with the observation that, "men express themselves through language by availing themselves of the typical patterns of expression

---

<sup>62</sup> Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte? Second Edition*, 31. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, 24-25.

<sup>63</sup> Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," 2. E. P. Sanders, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 453.

conventional in their societies.”<sup>64</sup> These typical patterns can, but need not be structure, setting, content, function, etc., “The components which comprise a text’s typicality are not always unified in the same way.”<sup>65</sup> Knierim expands the sense of what *can* be typical, but limits the requirement of what *must* be typical; in particular, he harshly critiques Gunkel’s requirement of a *Sitz im Leben*. Knierim contrasts Gunkel’s sociological concept of a genre with his own linguistic concept.<sup>66</sup> Similarly, Doty calls for more possibilities of what may (or may not) be typical, “Generic definitions ought not be restricted to any one particular feature (such as form, content, etc.), but they ought to be widely enough constructed to allow one to conceive of a genre as a congeries of (a limited number of) factors.”<sup>67</sup> More factors can be typical, but genre cannot be identified with any one factor, especially not social setting.

Both Knierim and Doty maintain a distinction between form and genre. The latter might include forms and various other elements. They refuse to conflate the two or reduce genre to formal morphology. Doty says clearly, “‘Forms’ are constituent elements of genres, and can be identified by *scientific* criteria. Generally, forms are smaller elements than genres, and it will often be possible to chart forms typical of certain genres.”<sup>68</sup> The term “scientific” points to a major shift from an idealized holistic understanding of explicit features along with reconstructed and hypothesized features, to

---

<sup>64</sup> Knierim, “Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered,” 449.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.: 458.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.: 442.

<sup>67</sup> Doty, “The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis,” 439-440.

<sup>68</sup> Emphasis added. Ibid., 439.



a practical sequential approach to the study of genre. Again, genres cannot be reduced to forms, but,

Generic *definitions* should focus upon the formal, structural composition of the literary works rather than upon thematology. It may be necessary to keep characteristic motifs in view, but identifications of subject matter are of dubious value, since related subjects may be expressed in several genres.<sup>69</sup>

Doty does not divorce the explicit formal features of a genre from the hypothesized thematic elements, but he does prioritize the formal elements for the purposes of definition. A definition does not describe a complete understanding of everything “typical” in a genre, it merely expresses as objectively as possible the foundation for subsequent study. There is a difference, but not an exclusive dichotomy, between definition and description. In the following pages it will be important to recognize that the *Semeia* 14 definition does not claim to describe all that is typical in apocalypses. Genre theory since 1979 will have much to add to the understanding of genre, but will not fundamentally challenge the preliminary task of identifying and defining the genre morphologically. The relationship between definition and description is not “definition or description,” but “definition then description.”<sup>70</sup>

From this section it should be clear that two very different approaches to the study of literary types are found in Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung* and the understanding of literary genre articulated by Knierim and Doty, and followed by *Semeia* 14. Unfortunately, these two archetypes do not exhaust the number of conceptions that have

---

<sup>69</sup> Emphasis added. Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> See below, Section 2.2.4.1, page 90.

been pursued in scholarship, nor is the distinction between *Gattung* and genre universally observed. As we move from the history of scholarship on concepts of “genre” to the study of the genre “apocalypse” in particular, it will often be necessary to discern the conception underlying scholarly claims. We shall soon turn to the possibility of defining the genre morphologically. First, however, we will take up the question of the relationship between elements that had previously been understood as necessarily coincident: the literary genre “apocalypse,” the apocalyptic worldview, and the socio-religious phenomenon of apocalypticism. Our main interest lies between the first two, genre and worldview. On one hand, it is indeed essential to maintain the possibility of separating these distinct elements, for they are not *always* co-incident. On the other hand, we can make the case for some relationship between them. The apocalypse literary genre is not devoid of meaning; rather, it causes the audience to anticipate the apocalyptic worldview.

### 2.1.3. Paul Hanson’s separation of literary genre and worldview

We already mentioned the rediscovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a major contribution to the increased interest in Jewish apocalyptic literature, and the need to re-evaluate some terminology and presumptions. We should now say more in particular about the problem posed by the sectarian documents from Qumran for the reified concept of “apocalyptic.” Previously, a number of generalizations about “apocalyptic” had been based on minor coincidences between a small number of “exemplary cases.” More data naturally contradicted weak and simple theories. Specifically, the sectarian documents challenged the view of “apocalyptic” as a single entity with its own way of thinking and

mode of expression. With retrospect, we can explain the evidence by saying that the sectarians held a basic worldview very similar to the one typically conveyed by apocalypses, but did not use the genre “apocalypse” to express their worldview. That statement was very difficult in the making, as it requires a separation between literary genre and worldview. As Stegemann said, depending on whether one defines “apocalyptic” as using a literary genre or conveying a worldview, the sectarian documents are either wholly or not at all apocalyptic.<sup>71</sup>

The Scrolls demanded a distinction to describe the situation when the literary genre and the worldview do not coincide, but much remained to be said about the relationship between the now distinguishable elements. At one extreme, several scholars called for a complete divorce between the two concepts. At the other extreme, some proposed preserving a vague or essentialist notion of what an apocalypse *par excellence* is. Individual texts could be described as more or less apocalypse-like on a number of spectra corresponding to multiple levels of abstraction. We shall consider the merits of these proposals, but ultimately conclude with Collins that the literary genre should be distinguished and defined without reference to the worldview, but that the genre does typically convey a worldview which can be found in other literary genres.

---

<sup>71</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 496. Philonenko calls Qumran apocalyptic based on its apocalyptic thought, while Carmignac and Stegemann, based on the literary genre, severely limit the extent to which the term applies to Qumran. Marc Philonenko, “L’apocalyphtique qoumrânienne,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 211-218. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyphtique,” 3-33. Jean Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyphtique dans l’Ancien Testament,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 163-170.

Although we found traces of distinctions in previous scholarship, Paul Hanson was the most influential in thoroughly proposing that the literary genre, worldview (which he identified with eschatology), and social setting of the apocalypses should be studied separately, and that distinct terminology should be used in each case. In a number of ways Hanson left the completion of the job to others, but the significance of his contributions is unmistakable. In particular, we should note that Hanson was interested in the sociological study of religion and proposed his distinction in the interest of disentangling literary details from the features of ideology, social origins and function.<sup>72</sup> In a sense, this chapter is interested in the same disentanglement so that the explicit literary features can be studied without speculative sociological reconstructions. While this work may not resemble *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*<sup>73</sup> on most levels, both share a common foundation.

The seeds of Hanson's distinction can be found in his 1971 article, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment."<sup>74</sup> Although he still uses "apocalyptic" as a noun, he adds in a footnote that it would be better to speak of "apocalyptic eschatology."<sup>75</sup> More importantly, he critiques the approach to apocalyptic as a *Gattung* (as we discussed above), he proposes a precise and explicit definition, and he critiques the attempts to define "apocalyptic" with long lists of characteristics of

---

<sup>72</sup> "The book of Revelation will help to clarify the latter [apocalypticism], not by analysis of literary genre, but by a study of its position in the history of the socioreligious phenomenon of apocalyptic movements." Hanson, "Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism," 29.

<sup>73</sup> Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

<sup>74</sup> Paul D. Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment," *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 31-58.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*: 35 n. 35.

which no apocalypse has all (as we will discuss below).<sup>76</sup> His definition in this work is based on a proposed sociological situation, with no real reference to literary mode.<sup>77</sup> His main interest here is to set up an “essential” contrast between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology. The separation of the terms apocalypse, apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism was yet to come.

In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Hanson distinguishes and defines separately the genre “apocalypse,” apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism.<sup>78</sup> Hanson defines “apocalypse” as “a literary genre which is one of the favored media used by apocalyptic writers to communicate their messages.”<sup>79</sup> He elaborates only a little, starting with the typical features of the first work designated an apocalypse, the Apocalypse of John.<sup>80</sup> He defines “apocalyptic eschatology” as “a religious perspective, a way of viewing divine plans in relation to mundane realities.” The following sub-section will address the importance of not identifying the apocalyptic worldview with

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.: 33-35.

<sup>77</sup> “Apocalyptic [footnote: more accurately, one should perhaps use the term ‘apocalyptic eschatology’ ...] we define as the disclosure (usually esoteric in nature) to the elect of the prophetic vision of Yahweh’s sovereignty (including his future dealings with his people, the inner secrets of the cosmos, etc.) which vision the visionaries have ceased to translate into the terms of plain history, real politics and human instrumentality because of a pessimistic view of reality growing out of the bleak post-Exilic conditions in which the visionary group found itself, conditions seemingly unsuitable to them as a context for the envisioned restoration of Yahweh’s people.” Ibid.: 35.

<sup>78</sup> Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” 27-34.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>80</sup> In advance of our discussion below as to whether function belongs to literary genre or social setting, we should mention that, on the one hand, Hanson includes “setting and function” as a subsection of “the apocalypse genre in the book of Revelation” along with “structure and typical features.” On the other hand, when he expands to “other apocalypses” he notes that the genre can have multiple functions. We should also mention that he only notes explicit textual features under the setting and function of the Apocalypse of John. It would seem that Hanson considers setting and function to be part of any one text’s literary genre, but since it is variable it cannot constitute a part of the definition.

eschatology or any other single issue, but this adjustment in terminology is incidental to Hanson's basic point. It is not a creed or a constitution but "a perspective which individuals and groups can embrace in varying degrees at different times."<sup>81</sup> Hanson contrasts apocalyptic eschatology with prophetic eschatology largely on the basis of the agency of human persons. Finally, Hanson defines "apocalypticism" as "the symbolic universe in which an apocalyptic movement codifies its identity and interpretation of reality."<sup>82</sup> He emphasizes that apocalypticism is a phenomenon, not a tradition. In antiquity there were many independently occurring apocalyptic movements. "The symbolic universe of an individual apocalyptic movement is not handed down to it ready-made by an authoritative antecedent tradition."<sup>83</sup> Consequently, "it is not possible to give one formal cognitive definition of apocalypticism."<sup>84</sup>

Hanson left to others much of the work of explicating the relationship between the three elements.<sup>85</sup> Relative to his predecessors, he emphasizes the separation, but he does hold them to be interrelated. "While apocalypticism cannot be identified with the perspective of apocalyptic eschatology, a relationship does exist: apocalypticism is latent

---

<sup>81</sup> Hanson, "Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism," 29.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>85</sup> Most recently, Paolo Sacchi and James Charlesworth continued the discussion on the relationship between genre, ideology, and social movement. Paolo Sacchi, "The Book of the Watchers as an Apocalyptic and Apocryphal Text," *Henoch* 30, no. 1 (2008): 9-11. James H. Charlesworth, "What Is an Apocalyptic Text, and How Do We Know That? Seeking the Provenience of the Book of the Watchers," *Henoch* 30, no. 1 (2008): 37-39. Sacchi reviews the terms and distinctions in his prior work. Charlesworth expresses reservations about focusing too much on elements in texts and isolating form from function or ideas from literary genre.

in apocalyptic eschatology, and can grow out of the perspective it provides.”<sup>86</sup> He implies a looser connection with the genre “apocalypse” in that he emphasizes that other genres can be used by to express the worldview, and mentions the Testament of Levi as having a function at odds with his understanding of the worldview. While Hanson had the last word on none of his three definitions, he is widely followed in distinguishing three terms for three aspects or levels of abstraction. Before moving on to the arguments for and against more radically separating these aspects, we should consider the response to Hanson on two issues: first, alternatives to the three levels of abstraction, and then the resistance to identifying the apocalyptic worldview with apocalyptic eschatology.

While it may be dangerous to blur the nuances between the various three-fold distinctions, similarities can certainly be found between Gunkel’s three elements of *Gattung* and Hanson’s three related but not coincident concepts. One might imagine, however, that the attraction to the number three has more to do with cultural aesthetics than objective properties of the literature. While no alternative proposal has been more influential, it will be worth noting that more than three levels of abstraction have been found when sought. Again, it may be useful to think more in terms of a spectrum or matrix than in absolute categories. James Barr, for the first example, lists a minimum of four levels, “language use... structure... the sort of thing that is told... [and] doctrine.”<sup>87</sup> These are indeed valid distinctions, even if they could be treated as sub-aspects of the literary genre and worldview. One could still add additional levels of social setting and function, explicit or interpreted. Lars Hartman picks a different (but comparable) three

---

<sup>86</sup> Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” 30. Also, page 29.

<sup>87</sup> Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 16.

with sub-types: linguistic/stylistic characteristics, the propositional level, and socio-linguistic function.<sup>88</sup> Hellholm's approach revels in levels and aspects, but is based generally on form, content and function.<sup>89</sup> It should be kept in mind that grouping the aspects and levels of abstraction of a text serves for convenience but may require further qualification.

On a related note, we should warn the reader that the apocalypse-apocalyptic-apocalypticism distinction is sometimes used differently from Hanson's proposal. Jean Carmignac uses the equivalents shifted toward the explicit literary features,

Il faut distinguer entre "Apocalypse", qui est une œuvre littéraire, "Apocalyptique", qui est le genre littéraire employé dans une telle œuvre, et "Apocalyptisme", qui est la systématisation des caractéristiques de ce genre littéraire.<sup>90</sup>

As we shall see, Carmignac seeks a strong divorce of the "scientific" literary study of the apocalypses from the theological assertions about "apocalyptic." Although he has not been widely followed in this, James Barr proposes that exemplary cases be called apocalypses and marginal cases be called "apocalyptic," in the sense of apocalypse-esque.<sup>91</sup> Even among scholars who maintain the same basic distinction, the reader must maintain some flexibility when encountering phrases such as, "apocalypticism as a worldview," rather than "the apocalyptic worldview."<sup>92</sup> In this study

---

<sup>88</sup> Hartman, "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre," 332-335.

<sup>89</sup> David Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 13-64.

<sup>90</sup> Carmignac, "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament," 164-165.

<sup>91</sup> Barr, "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study," 18-19.

<sup>92</sup> Boccaccini, "Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship," 35. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 14. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic



“apocalypticism” will be used only to refer to a religio-social phenomenon or putative tradition.

#### 2.1.4. The apocalyptic worldview of which eschatology is one part

Hanson’s terminology must be adjusted from “apocalyptic eschatology” to “apocalyptic worldview.” The importance of eschatology in the apocalyptic worldview is still debated. It is best to include eschatology (broadly defined to include personal eschatology)<sup>93</sup> as part of the worldview, against the extremes of making it the only part or no part at all. In fact, several aspects of the worldview have sometimes been claimed as “essential,” “key,” or “definitive.” Most of them fit in the broad definition of the worldview defined above through the illocution of the genre, but none should eclipse consideration of the others.<sup>94</sup> It is worth reviewing debates about approaching the apocalypses through views of eschatology, parentage in prophecy and wisdom, a particular mode of revelation, dualism and the permeation thereof, temple cosmology, or none of the above.

Despite using the term “apocalyptic eschatology,” eschatology is not particularly central to Hanson’s description of the apocalyptic worldview in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*.<sup>95</sup> Elsewhere Hanson talks about apocalyptic eschatology as “one

---

Compatibility,” 387. John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London; New York: Routledge, 1997), 8.

<sup>93</sup> Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 16.

<sup>94</sup> See above, Section 1.2.

<sup>95</sup> Hanson, “Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism,” 29.

strand” among others at the heart of apocalyptic literature.<sup>96</sup> Earlier scholars had a greater tendency to overvalue one insight as definitive, and reduce everything else to “coloring.”<sup>97</sup> The tendency may also be found more recently, in Paul Owen’s argument for the primacy of eschatology over cosmology and heavenly secrets in the early apocalypses.<sup>98</sup> In the 1970s several scholars reacted to the former overemphasis on eschatology,<sup>99</sup> and since then several scholars in England have followed Christopher Rowland in rejecting eschatology as a major theme of the apocalyptic worldview.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 7.

<sup>97</sup> So particularly, Vielhauer defined “apocalyptic” as a particular expression of eschatology. Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 597-598.

<sup>98</sup> Paul Owen, “The Relationship of Eschatology to Esoteric Wisdom in the Jewish Pseudepigraphal Apocalypses,” in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, ed. Craig A. Evans (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 122-133.

<sup>99</sup> The first work dedicated to rejecting the centrality of eschatology appeared in 1978, Graham I. Davies, “Apocalyptic and Historiography,” *Journal of the Old Testament* 5 (1978): 15-28. Carmignac, reacting to the overvaluation of the importance of eschatology and working with a narrow definition of eschatology, rejected not only the importance of eschatology but the possibility of including any such “contents” into the definition of the literary genre. Although I am sympathetic to the attempt to define the genre based on the most explicit elements possible, his extremely formal definitions do not suffice to distinguish the apocalypses from other revelatory literature. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 11, 13. Similarly, previous scholars had given Stegemann reason to believe that the relationship between apocalypses and eschatology was purely of terminological confusion. Again, his point depends on a definition of eschatology that excludes personal or realized eschatology. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalypsik,” 500. Rowland also emphasizes the diversity of contents found in his loosely defined genre. Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 70-72. In a review of Collins’ *The Apocalyptic Imagination* and Stone’s *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Rowland acknowledged the importance of eschatological material, but maintained that it is secondary to the “visionary/vertical dimension.” Christopher Rowland, “Review of: *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*, by John J. Collins; and *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 37, no. 2 (1986): 489-490.

<sup>100</sup> R. Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul’s Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, JSNTSup 127 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 284. Lester L. Grabbe, “Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 114-115. In a forthcoming article Fletcher-Louis writes, “Whilst the ‘apocalypses’ contain much else besides the transcendent eschatology that is supposed to define apocalypticism, some appear to be practically devoid of a transcendent eschatology.” Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.”

Fletcher-Louis in particular has accused the *Semeia* 14 definition of being obsessed with eschatology.<sup>101</sup> By my read, the definition speaks of transcendence on the temporal axis and uses the adjective “eschatological” in a subordinate clause. Transcendence on the temporal axis includes any “bird’s-eye” view of the meaning of history, often but not exclusively history’s final goal. It may be true that the word “eschatology” is too diverse in its connotations to be useful, and Fletcher-Louis is certainly right to correct any tendency to read eschatology as the heart of the morphological definition of the genre. In other writings, Collins has made clear that eschatology includes personal eschatology, and that eschatology should be neither overemphasized nor denied an essential role.<sup>102</sup> Collins has argued that eschatology is one of the more robust features which distinguish the apocalypses from earlier “prophetic” eschatology, but this is not a claim of the essence of “apocalyptic.”<sup>103</sup> Collins’ stronger and more basic claim is that apocalypses should be studied in their own right, not primarily as a deviation from a “parent” such as prophecy or wisdom.<sup>104</sup> This brings us to the next approach that should not be considered singularly definitive of the apocalyptic worldview.

---

<sup>101</sup> “The definition demands that an apocalypse be concerned with transcendent eschatology. However, there remain swathes of revelatory material in the apocalypses which have nothing to do with eschatology, nor an obviously ‘transcendent’ kind of eschatology. This suggests that a ‘transcendent eschatology’ is really only incidental to the genre and need not be present in every case.” Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.” See also, Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 272 n. 55.

<sup>102</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 10-12.

<sup>103</sup> John J. Collins, “Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 49-50.

<sup>104</sup> “Biblical scholars have always been troubled by the strangeness of apocalyptic literature, and have tried to domesticate it by subsuming it under a more familiar category, such as prophecy or wisdom. Is it not time to stop playing this game and to study apocalyptic literature as a distinct phenomenon in its own right?” Ibid., 51.

Much of the early history of study of the apocalypses and “apocalyptic” was dedicated to comparing and contrasting (negatively) “apocalyptic” and “prophecy.”<sup>105</sup> One development was to balance or replace the view of apocalyptic as the child of prophecy with a view of apocalyptic as the child of wisdom.<sup>106</sup> Although much has been gained by studying apocalypses together with wisdom literature and prophetic literature, it has not been profitable to seek a definition or essence of apocalyptic in terms of prophecy. Prophecy itself is difficult to define, and does not compare easily either as a general abstraction at particular levels of literary genre, worldview, or religio-social phenomenon. At least for purposes of definition and classification, it has been more profitable to study the apocalypses in their own right, as suggested by D. S. Russell in 1964.<sup>107</sup> Recently, however, Lester Grabbe has returned to the task of defining “apocalyptic” as a sub-category of “prophetic,” and “prophetic” in turn as a sub-category of “divinatory” or “mantic.”<sup>108</sup> In the process, Grabbe challenges the arguments advanced

---

<sup>105</sup> See especially Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*. Charles, for example, lists four points of contrast that distinguish apocalyptic thought: the belief in a blessed future life, the expectation of a new heaven and new earth, the catastrophic end of the world, and a broader unity of history. R. H. Charles, *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments*, Home University Library of Modern Knowledge (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1914), 18-23.

<sup>106</sup> Gerhard von Rad first proposed understanding apocalyptic as a child of wisdom. Müller refined von Rad’s argument by specifying “mantic” wisdom. VanderKam contributed greatly to the study of the interplay of forms of wisdom, prophecy and apocalyptic thought. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 306. Hans-Peter Müller, “Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” in *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971*, ed. P. A. H. de Boer, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268-293. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984). James C. VanderKam, “The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought,” in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane*, ed. James D. Martin and Philip R Davies, JSOT Sup 42 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1986), 163-176. See further below, page 233, note 95.

<sup>107</sup> “Despite its likeness to prophecy, it is nevertheless in many respects a new creation with a character and ‘personality’ of its own.” Russell, *Method & Message*, 104.

<sup>108</sup> Grabbe, “Prophetic and Apocalyptic,” 129.

by Koch, Hanson, and Collins, but does not propose a new definition of his own.

Whatever merit there may be in re-examining scholarly consensus, the task of defining the apocalyptic worldview is still best separated from the task of comparing the eschatology of prophetic and apocalyptic literature.

If overemphasis on eschatology and the temporal axis is related to thinking of apocalypses in terms of prophecy, overemphasis on the mode of revelation may be related to thinking of apocalypses in terms of mantic wisdom and divination.<sup>109</sup> It is appealing to define the literary genre or worldview solely or primarily in terms of the revelation of hidden things.<sup>110</sup> After all, the word itself implies “uncovering,” not spatial or temporal things revealed. In practice, defining what unites all the apocalypses and distinguishes them from other works cannot be done without saying something about the hidden things revealed. The view of revelation has special significance in the apocalyptic worldview, but cannot claim exclusive significance.

The arguments about over- or under-emphasis on eschatology, relationship to prophecy and wisdom, and mode of revelation are questions of degree among elements implicit in the literary genre. Two other issues offer promising insights into the

---

<sup>109</sup> Christopher Rowland, “The Intertestamental Literature,” in *The History of Christian Theology, Volume Two: The Study and Use of the Bible*, ed. P. Avis (Basingstoke; Grand Rapids: Marshall Pickering; Eerdmans, 1988), 202-203. Cited in Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 275. Owen suggests that one’s view of the apocalyptic worldview as more about eschatology or more about secret revelation may be influenced by one’s period of study: looking back from Merkabah literature the revelatory element of apocalypses seems more important, whereas looking forward from biblical prophecy, eschatology appears more distinctive. Owen, “The Relationship of Eschatology,” 129-131.

<sup>110</sup> See below, Section 2.2.4.3 for Stegemann’s attempt to define the literary genre in terms of heavenly revelation. Rowland is more interested in the essence of “apocalyptic” as an ideology than a literary genre, but similarly finds this essence in the view of the “open heaven,” “Apocalyptic seems essentially to be about the revelation of the divine mysteries through visions or some other form of immediate disclosure of heavenly truths.” Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 71. See also Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 288.

worldview, although the basic point remains that no one issue should be elevated to the singular essence of the worldview. The first of these is dualism and the permeation thereof. Crispin Fletcher-Louis offers an insightful critique of the assumption that dualism defines the apocalyptic worldview.<sup>111</sup> I agree that “dualism” is not helpful for describing the apocalyptic worldview, and I avoid the term in my own work. Another matter is whether the assumption of dualism pervades North American scholarship on apocalypses, and particularly the *Semeia* 14 definition.<sup>112</sup> At any rate, the best recent constructive work on the matter of dualism and the apocalypses has come from Frances Flannery-Dailey, who shows the interest of the apocalypses in *overcoming* ontological, spatial and temporal boundaries.<sup>113</sup>

In the same forthcoming article, Fletcher-Louis makes an innovative case for approaching the apocalyptic worldview through temple cosmology.<sup>114</sup> This approach shows great potential, and corrects some unfortunate prior assumptions. Temple

---

<sup>111</sup> Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.”

<sup>112</sup> “Collins and others who work with his definition in the field of Jewish studies remain attached to the view that apocalypticism is a dualistic worldview... Although the *Semeia* volume speaks of ‘transcendence’ not ‘dualism,’ ... it is really the transcendence of an ontological and temporal dualism that the definition has in mind.” Ibid. Without dwelling on the claim of what the definition has in mind, one should notice the difference between positing a dualistic worldview and positing a worldview of the transcendence of dualism. Flannery-Dailey’s language of “permeability” is perhaps more clear on this, but comparable in meaning. Fletcher-Louis goes on to suggest an escape from the assumption of dualism by appreciating the homology of imagery in the apocalypses and Daniel 7 in particular, not unlike Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 106. For Viehauer’s claim that “the essential feature of Apocalyptic is its dualism” see page 41 in the present work.

<sup>113</sup> Frances Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*, JSJSup 90 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 272. Frances Flannery-Dailey, “Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature,” in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*, ed. April D. De Conick (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 241, 247.

<sup>114</sup> Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism.” Fletcher-Louis builds on the contribution of Margaret Barker, “Beyond the Veil of the Temple: The High Priestly Origins of the Apocalypses,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51, no. 1 (1998): 1-21.

cosmology is still not a singular essential feature of universal, pervasive and robust significance, but the proposal warrants further consideration and refinement. The present work deals with views of the temple as part of the temporal axis, particularly the question of whether the temple will be replaced with a new temple and a new creation. One could say that Jubilees is like other apocalypses in its concern with the temple and its heavenly counterpart, but different in the view of the current Jerusalem temple as adequate and permanent. Fletcher-Louis' proposal calls for more analysis along these lines in the future.

Finally, it should be noted that Barry Matlock argued extensively for abandoning hope of identifying any apocalyptic worldview whatsoever.<sup>115</sup> One can understand Matlock's reaction to a long series of assertions about the essence of "apocalyptic," particularly in Pauline scholarship. He does not deny the significance of the category "apocalypses," only that we need the abstraction "apocalyptic" to make comparisons between ideas in Paul and ideas in the apocalypses. Although Koch, Hanson and Collins addressed similar concerns, Matlock seems to view their efforts as putting band-aids on a corpse that should simply be buried once and for all.<sup>116</sup> The present work still speaks of an apocalyptic worldview as a cluster of compatible ideas typically implicit in the use of

---

<sup>115</sup> "The grander designs of 'apocalyptic eschatology' and 'apocalypticism', it is hoped, will soon be put to rest." Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 298. "I have tried to suggest... we relinquish the idea of having some 'second term'—'apocalyptic', 'apocalyptic eschatology', 'apocalypticism', or whatever—floating about beyond the literature and seeming to make some historical connection with it." Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 291. Matlock also quotes Barton to this effect, "This has the effect of abolishing the noun 'apocalyptic'. As the name of a literary genre, 'apocalypse' is indispensable. But Rowland seems to me already to have shown that the attempt to find any unifying theme among all the apocalypses is doomed to failure." John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1986), 201.

<sup>116</sup> See, for example, Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 288-289, 291 n. 98.

the genre “apocalypse,” but Matlock offers a valuable reminder that the worldview is not a thing in itself.

In conclusion, Hanson’s term “apocalyptic eschatology” must be revised to avoid the suggestion that the apocalyptic worldview consists exclusively, essentially, or even primarily of eschatology. Likewise, no other single issue or theme can be taken as definitive. While it makes sense to start with the illocution of the literary genre for the broad outline of views typically implied, this starting point must remain open to addition, and be used humbly as a rubric for talking about texts, rather than an object of study in itself.

#### 2.1.5. The radical divorce

While Koch, Hanson and Barr maintained some relationship between the genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview, Carmignac and Stegemann (and to some extent Stone) called for a complete divorce. This could be seen as an overreaction to the terminological and conceptual confusion noted by Koch and Barr, but the merits of their proposals should be considered in their own right. In the following sub-section we will consider the case for some relationship between genre and worldview, and the next section will consider the possibility of defining the genre morphologically. Indeed, it will not be possible to define the genre based only on the most explicit literary forms without including some literary contents (as opposed to worldview contents). The basic principle, however, is shared. The definition and study of the apocalypses should begin with the explicit features and build thereon in moving toward the hypothetical, speculative, and reconstructed. For Carmignac and Stegemann a keyword is “scientific.” The study of



ancient literature may not benefit from limiting itself to the scientific method, but clarity can be gained from objectivity in definitions.

Michael Stone's postscript in "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," is primarily concerned with critiquing the attempts to define the genre "apocalypse" and "apocalyptic" with lists of characteristics and exemplary cases, as we shall consider in the following section. Stone emphasizes that "apocalyptic eschatology" does not explain the apocalypses, that it is not limited to the apocalypses, and that by previous definitions few if any apocalypses are "truly apocalyptic."<sup>117</sup> This much is all true and should be kept in mind, but should qualify and not prohibit explicating the worldview typically conveyed by the apocalypses. In 1984 Stone elaborates, maintaining precision but emphasizing the need for separation, "Clarity is to be achieved only if a clear distinction is drawn." While in 1976 Stone proposed that the term "apocalypticism" be abandoned, in 1984 he recognizes its validity as long as the apocalypses are not reduced to apocalypticism, "An illusion persists... that by defining apocalypticism something has been said about the apocalypses.... [Each] must be dealt with in its own right."<sup>118</sup> Stone's points are valid as far as they go, but should not be taken as a rejection of the possibility of a link between the literary genre and a typical set of ideas.

---

<sup>117</sup> "Finally, it may perhaps be suggested that the terms 'apocalyptic' and 'apocalypticism' be abandoned altogether. They will continue to confuse the issue as they tend to imply an identity between the way of thought they designate and the apocalypses. The writer does not deny the tremendous importance of this pattern of thought in the apocalypses, yet it is not exclusive to the apocalypses. Indeed the 'truly apocalyptic' apocalypses are the exception rather than the rule." Michael E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, ed. Werner E. Lemke, Patrick D. Miller, and Frank Moore Cross (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 443.

<sup>118</sup> Michael E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen, Philadelphia: Van Gorcum, Fortress, 1984), 394.

Jean Carmignac calls for a more radical divorce. It is true that no one distinctive trait defines the worldview of the apocalypses apart from other genres, and again we agree that “apocalyptic” should neither be reified nor defined by one essential idea or a list of characteristic doctrines. Carmignac considers three options to be mutually exclusive: as a theology, as a literary genre, or as a literary genre which conveys a theology.<sup>119</sup> Unfortunately, his critique of the last option is mostly a critique of Gerhard von Rad. Carmignac is of course right that there is not a single uniform systematic theology which all the apocalypses convey and which is found only in apocalypses.

Car un genre littéraire peut convenir à plusieurs théologies et chaque théologie peut s'exprimer dans des genres littéraires différents. Définir l'un par rapport à l'autre, c'est confondre deux plans. La science ne peut rien gagner à une telle confusion, qui est en elle-même non-scientifique.<sup>120</sup>

More subtle possibilities need to be considered, however. While the genre does convey a plurality of theologies, overlap and patterns can be found within that plurality. While that cluster of overlapping ideas is not exclusive to the apocalypses, that does not answer the question of whether the genre expresses some typical notions. Admittedly, the cluster does not add up to “une certaine théologie.”<sup>121</sup> While a literary genre should not be defined with reference to the worldview it typically conveys, and the apocalyptic worldview is not limited to the apocalypses, the apocalyptic worldview can be defined as the worldview that is typically found in the apocalypses. Carmignac leaves no room for

---

<sup>119</sup> At Uppsala Carmignac does adopt the distinction between apocalypse, apocalyptic and apocalypticism, but dedicates them all to aspects of genre, maintaining the rejection of any term for a worldview derived from ἀποκάλυψις. Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” 164-165.

<sup>120</sup> Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 19.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

an apocalyptic worldview in his effort to deal objectively and scientifically with the apocalypses. Adherence to the most objective standards is a noble interest but can be taken to extremes, as we shall see again when we consider the possibility of defining the genre.<sup>122</sup>

Hartmut Stegemann likewise limits the term “apocalyptic” to a literary phenomenon. Only apocalypses can be called apocalyptic, except in small isolated instances when another work directly imitates the apocalypses.<sup>123</sup> Again, the scientific ideal prohibits calling ideas “apocalyptic” in connection to other works, “Meiner Auffassung nach ist ein solches Vorgehen grundsätzlich falsch und vom wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt her illegitim.”<sup>124</sup> Two further points are particularly interesting about Stegemann’s argument. First, along the lines of our distinction above between *Gattung* and genre, Stegemann rejects the existence of an apocalypse *Gattung*. However,

Allenfalls kann man von einem literarischen “genre” sprechen, wenn man diesen Begriff nicht im Sinne von “Gattung” versteht, sondern sich ausschließlich an inhaltlichen Kriterien orientiert (so z. B. J. J. Collins 1979).<sup>125</sup>

Although Collins speaks of both form and contents of the literary genre, Stegemann is right that Collins’ definition avoids the more speculative content of the worldview that

---

<sup>122</sup> As we shall see, Collins distinguishes worldview from literary genre, but includes both literary form and literary contents in the definition of the literary genre. Carmignac dismisses not only the possibility of a theology associated with the apocalypses, but also any reference to literary contents in a definition of the literary genre. Carmignac’s noble effort to base his definition only on the most explicit and formal features unfortunately fails to distinguish the apocalypses from other revelatory literature or the dreams of Joseph in Genesis.

<sup>123</sup> Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 499-500.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., 499.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., 527 n. 107.

comprises a *Gattung*. Another salient point in Stegemann's treatment will lead us to the next sub-section, on the case for some relationship. Although Stegemann vehemently opposes the identification of eschatology (which he defines narrowly) with the apocalyptic worldview, he does accept the possibility that conceptual content is inherently implied in a literary form. As it happens, and as we shall discuss in the next section, Stegemann attempts a definition that focuses only on the manner of revelation. From this he says that the idea of heavenly secret knowledge is implied by the definition.

Denn der für die "Apokalyptik" zentrale Gedanke, der literarisch die Apokalypsen konstituiert, ist nicht das—nur tatsächlich häufig benutzte—Geschichtskonzept der "Eschatologie", sondern die Mitteilung von "himmlischem Geheimwissen", das durch diese Schriften "offenbart" wird...<sup>126</sup>

Differences in the definitions of the literary genre and eschatology notwithstanding, Stegemann is certainly correct that a set of ideas is directly implied by the use of a genre.

In summation, while the above emphases and conclusions in the interest of radically separating the literary genre from the worldview cannot be accepted, a number of important points come out of the discussion. The scientific interest in objectivity is noble to the extent that it is possible. The definition of the genre "apocalypse" should begin with the more explicit features (even if further description is inevitably speculative). An understanding of the apocalypses and their genre must begin with the texts, not a preconceived notion of apocalyptic theology. The adjective "apocalyptic" should refer to what is typically true of the apocalypses. Even from the most formal definition of a literary genre a certain "illocutionary" implication of conceptual contents follows.

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 500.

#### 2.1.6. The case for some relationship

The case for some relationship between the genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview can be argued in two ways. First, one could study the apocalypses inductively to see what conceptual features they all share. This method has clear advantages, despite the amount of study required to identify accurately the conceptual features of a large number of texts. In the following chapters we will examine Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses for a certain base set of conceptual features, although we will by no means claim to exhaust all the conceptual features of any of those texts. Before beginning such a detailed evaluation of the sources, some sound logic can tell us what conceptual features we can expect to find in a genre. The conceptual implications of the formal features of a genre have been called the “illocution” of the text, or what it says in speaking the way it speaks. This notion is partly implicit in the minor point made by Stegemann above, and further developed by Hartman, Hellholm, Collins, and others.<sup>127</sup>

Once a morphological definition of the literary genre is achieved one can ask what the use of the specific elements of the definition inherently suggest. As we already saw in Stegemann’s essay, the framework of revelation implies the relevance of heavenly secret knowledge (which one might naturally seek to contrast with earthly public knowledge). As we shall see, the literary contents of transcendence on the spatial axis suggest a worldview that maintains the significance of non-human beings and hidden places for human understanding. The literary contents of transcendence on the temporal

---

<sup>127</sup> Lars Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” *Ibid.*, 334. Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” 13-64. Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 11-32.

axis suggest a view of history that cannot be seen from the present but can be seen in a broader perspective which encompasses the beginning, end, or internal pattern of history. Each of these specific expected implications should and will be tested against the textual evidence. Further, the specific implications should not outweigh the more general principle that a genre creates a reader expectation (*Lesererwartung*).<sup>128</sup>

Hanson reversed the reified concept of apocalyptic and advanced the idea that “apocalypse” could be defined as a literary genre without reference to its worldview or social setting. This trend, especially in extreme forms, has aroused concern that the short-sighted pursuit of clarity has reduced the significance of “apocalyptic” to literary genre.<sup>129</sup> In response to the concern of reductionism it should be emphasized that the purpose of a definition of a genre is not to encompass all the typical features of a text or even a body of texts.<sup>130</sup> Further study can and should take place, but a definition by itself should indulge in no more speculation than absolutely necessary to distinguish a genre from related genres. Although Koch, Barr and Collins call for terminological clarity and place study of the literature as logically prior to theological generalizations, they do not dismiss the importance of theological investigation.<sup>131</sup> While Carmignac and Stegemann

---

<sup>128</sup> Hartman, “Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre,” 331.

<sup>129</sup> See especially Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 17-48. Also, Eibert Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” *JSJ* 18 (1987): 144.

<sup>130</sup> Sturm criticizes the *Semeia* 14 definition as dry and minimalist, “transcendence may sound less like the heart of apocalyptic and more like a lowest common denominator of the genre.” Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 25. It is worth being clear that the morphology of the genre does not claim to be the heart of any worldview or religious social movement.

<sup>131</sup> Sturm asserts, “If one takes literary genre as a starting point for research, the ideas of apocalyptic are important but *secondary*, as general features characteristic of the literature.” Ibid. Although Koch and Collins speak of a clear definition based on literary analysis as logically prior to conceptual

seek to disconnect the sectarian documents of Qumran from the language of “apocalyptic,” most scholars would acknowledge that the worldview that is defined as typical of the apocalypses need not be limited to the apocalypses.

Hanson did not attempt to provide a morphological definition of the genre, or even to demonstrate that the body of literature could in practice be distinguished without reference to criteria based on worldview and *Sitz im Leben*. This question received significant attention in the 1970s, particularly from the Apocalypse Group of the SBL Genres Project. While a number of earlier alternatives warrant consideration, and some of the critical response contributed some worthwhile clarifications, with *Semeia* 14 the SBL Apocalypse Group succeeded in providing a morphological definition of the literary genre “apocalypse.”

## 2.2. The possibility of defining the genre “apocalypse” morphologically

In this section we seek the best standard by which to establish the use of the genre “apocalypse” in the Book of Jubilees. We expect a good definition of the genre to reflect accurately a pattern in the ancient texts that conveyed meaning to the ancient audience (even if it was not named and defined until later). The genre “apocalypse” can be defined morphologically as it was in *Semeia* 14. A number of protests call attention to important clarifications and qualifications, but the morphological definition is valid and useful for what it is designed to do. One crucial distinction for this section is the distinction between

---

assertions about the “essence of apocalyptic,” they do not require a disjunction as in Sturm’s phrase, “important but secondary.” Logical sequence does not imply degrees of importance. The definition of the genre does not claim to be the most important part of the study of any text.

a definition and “a complete study of a genre.”<sup>132</sup> Although at times the tasks of definition and description have been seen as mutually exclusive, each serves a separate and legitimate purpose. A definition should allow one to identify use of the genre as objectively as possible by stating what is true of all the apocalypses and what distinguishes them from works which are not apocalypses. It should provide a standard by which terminology can be used consistently and precisely, and by which variation can be gauged. It need not tell us everything we would like to know about what is typical in a particular text, or even exhaust everything that may be true of all the apocalypses. Although a number of definitions and valid insights have been offered, the definition of the genre in *Semeia* 14 has not been surpassed for objectivity or functionality (given the purpose of a definition just mentioned and discussed below). Before coming to the *Semeia* 14 definition we should consider some earlier alternatives and the purpose of a definition of a genre. We will then consider the *Semeia* 14 definition and the resistance and clarifications that have followed. Separate sub-sections will be dedicated to the function amendment of *Semeia* 36 and prototype theory.

### 2.2.1. The earlier alternatives

Even before Hanson separated definitions for the genre “apocalypse” and apocalyptic worldview, some definitions could be considered attempts to define the genre morphologically. These can be grouped into two basic approaches, the “exemplary case” approach, and the “lists of characteristics” approach, reborn as the “family resemblance

---

<sup>132</sup> Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 1-2.



model.” Whatever insight these approaches contribute to describing the apocalypses, they are not efficient definitions.

The “exemplary case” approach has the advantage of being able to describe a set of continua along which a marginal case can be described as more or less like what are taken to be the prime examples (sometimes a single prime example or a non-existent hypothetical ideal). The exemplary cases would typically include the Apocalypse of John, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch, as well as Daniel and 1 Enoch in part or entirely. Although this approach can be traced to a time when fewer apocalypses were known and two in particular were given special status as a result of their canonicity, more recent proponents can be found. James Barr, for example, proposes that the term “apocalypse” be used only for the exemplary cases, and “apocalyptic” be used more in the sense of “apocalypse-esque,” i.e., comparable to the exemplary cases in some regards but not enough to be an exemplary case.<sup>133</sup> What is gained in flexibility is lost, however, in precision. Even if scholars could agree on a set of exemplary cases or a constructed ideal, it would remain impossible to convey a specific classification with such terminology. At best, each use of the term would be clearly qualified as to the manner and degree to which a work is like an exemplary case, along with the assumed importance or hierarchy of the various comparable features. Although such detailed study is indeed desirable and sometimes necessary when a work has multiple affinities, a precise definition is more efficient. Furthermore, a precise definition does not prohibit consideration of marginal cases with multiple affinities, but rather provides a standard by which one can describe more specifically the affinities and variations.

---

<sup>133</sup> Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 18-19.

The “exemplary case” approach can often be found in conjunction with the “list of characteristics” approach. Many lists have been offered,<sup>134</sup> but the issue is not so much the problems with any one item or any one list, but the facts that these lists do not claim to be true of all the apocalypses, and no one apocalypse contains all the items.<sup>135</sup> Thus the lists by themselves were at best descriptions of some more-or-less distinctive features that “often” or “sometimes” can be found in apocalypses. The descriptive lists might be considered definitions when coupled with a hierarchy of definitive characteristics or a specific formula for how many apocalyptic characteristics constitute an apocalypse, but no such proposal has gained traction. James Barr combines the “exemplary case” and “list of characteristics” approaches,

What we have is bundles of features on various levels; perhaps no work is so perfect and ideal an example of apocalyptic that it embodies all of these features, but substantial clusters of these features normally constitute sufficient reason to use the term apocalyptic, and still larger groupings of them, under more rigorous criteria, constitute adequate grounds for the use of the term apocalypse.<sup>136</sup>

This is not so much a definition as a case for keeping terminology loose and flexible, based on description and the intuition of the scholar. This case continued to be made after the *Semeia* 14 definition was proposed.<sup>137</sup> Descriptions do indeed have the advantage of

---

<sup>134</sup> Lücke, in the first modern critical study of the apocalypses, offers one of the more reasonable lists, summarized by Sturm, “a universal perspective as the scope of revelation, a particular reckoning of time, pseudonymity, an artistic presentation, a combination of visions and images, and the interpretive mediation of angels.” Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 18. For more lists see Vielhauer, “Apocalypses and Related Subjects,” 583-594. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 24-33. Russell, *Method & Message*, 105.

<sup>135</sup> Hanson and Stone have been particularly critical of this approach. Hanson, “Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment,” 33. Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 440.

<sup>136</sup> Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 18-19.

<sup>137</sup> Sanders proposes what he calls an “essentialist definition.” Sanders, “The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses,” 458. Rowland’s description also relies heavily on the intuition of the scholar. Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 70-72.

being able to say more without getting bogged down in exceptions. Definitions have their own separate purpose, however, and they are not mutually exclusive. There may be some gray area, as some definitions rely somewhat on the intuition of the scholar, and some descriptions achieve greater objectivity than others. As much as possible, terminology should be objective and mutually agreeable. This would bring us to the next sub-section, the purpose of a definition, but first we should consider a variant on the “list of characteristics” approach, the “family resemblance” approach.

The “family resemblance” approach represents an attempt to derive a definition from the lists of characteristics. This approach asserts that a meaningful classification cannot be defined on the basis of features that are always true, but only on the probability that several of a list of possibilities are true. The common analogy for the family resemblance model is drawn from the biological sciences, in the taxonomy of species. It is asserted that a classification of animal species cannot be stated objectively based on features that all member species have in common, but only as a series of related species. Each has significant overlap with one or more “neighbors,” but one end of the chain may have nothing in common with the other end. Rather than evaluating the legitimacy of the analogy,<sup>138</sup> we should focus on the core issue of whether the apocalypses can be defined based on “always-true” criteria. The basic method of the family resemblance model was proposed with respect to the apocalypses in 1976 by John G. Gammie.<sup>139</sup> Gammie avoided dealing with Hanson’s distinction, and sought to define “apocalyptic” on the

---

<sup>138</sup> Ironically, while Carmignac and Stegemann called for “scientific” standards of objectivity, science is here marshaled to deny the possibility of objectivity.

<sup>139</sup> John G. Gammie, “The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel,” *JBL* 95 (1976): 193 n. 16. The strength of Gammie’s approach is that it recognizes that the genre operates at the level of framework, and it dismisses the idea of a single essential feature.

basis of framework, constituent parts, and “ideational elements.” Given this starting point, one might agree that a precise definition could not define a corpus bound at all three levels, and thus it would be necessary to resort to a preponderance of optional elements. We have already begun to see, however, the advantages of approaching piecemeal the study of all things apocalyptic, starting with the literary forms. Alastair Fowler also promoted the family resemblance model as a general theory of genre.<sup>140</sup> Fowler’s point, however, is not that the family resemblance model provides a definition or is even preliminary to a definition, but that definition is not possible. This is true if one takes “definition” to be exclusive classification without the ability to qualify variation and overlap, and “genre” as encompassing the totality of what is typical.<sup>141</sup> It is worth remembering that the definition of the genre in *Semeia* 14 does not do all that one might like it to do. Tigchelaar also praised the family resemblance model.<sup>142</sup> As we shall see again, Tigchelaar makes a good case for not stopping with the definition.<sup>143</sup> He contributes greatly to the description of the apocalypses, but does not refute the possibility of defining the genre morphologically. More recently, genre theorists have developed “prototype” theory as a refinement of the family resemblance model.

---

<sup>140</sup> Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), 39-41. See especially page 41 for the history of the theory beginning with Stewart and Wittgenstein.

<sup>141</sup> Fowler denies that genres can be defined in an absolute sense, but not that they can be identified. “The character of genres is that they change. Only variations or modifications of convention have literary significance. This is not to say that literature cannot be identified. Certainly I should wish to avoid defeatism (or historical relativism) in this regard.” Ibid., 18.

<sup>142</sup> Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” 139. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End*, 8.

<sup>143</sup> The family resemblance model appeals to Tigchelaar as an aspect of an evolutionary model with its emphasis on diachronic development. We shall return to the issue of synchronic definition and diachronic study.

Prototype theory may initially sound like the exemplary case approach, but rests on different foundations. Section 2.2.6 will discuss the potential of prototype theory as a way forward, building on *Semeia* 14, but not replacing it. Finally we come to detailing the purpose of a definition of a literary genre as here conceived.

### 2.2.2. The purpose of a definition

The purpose of a definition of a literary genre, as here conceived, can be treated under three points. First, the definition should define the corpus on a practical level. Second, it should ground discussion in a data set by which assertions can be verified or falsified. Third, it should provide a standard by which variation can be measured. Again, a definition need not explain everything that is typical about a body of texts.

First, a definition should define a class in such a way that members can be identified as easily and objectively as possible. It should state what is true of all the members and what distinguishes the class from related classes, and particularly the super-category (in the case of the apocalypses, revelatory literature). Sturm's critique of the *Semeia* 14 definition, for example, should be taken as a compliment—it not only “may” but should, “sound less like the heart of apocalyptic and more like a lowest common denominator of the genre.”<sup>144</sup> It should also be able to handle new evidence; i.e., if it is inductive it should avoid features that the set might have in common by coincidence. While some interesting patterns have been found in apocalypses, a feature (e.g. the catchword “glory”) should not be considered definitive if a text could be considered an

---

<sup>144</sup> Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 25.

apocalypse by common sense if it lacked that feature. This relates to what John Collins described as “inner coherence.”<sup>145</sup>

Second, it should ground assertions in a corpus of texts by which assertions can be verified or falsified. As Koch and Barr illustrate in detail, it frequently happened that generalizations about apocalyptic and the apocalypses were based on vague notions that could not be verified or falsified with reference to a body of texts.<sup>146</sup> A clear definition does not censor what can be said, but it calls for precision. Thus an assertion about the apocalypses might need to be qualified in some way, such as the historical apocalypses, the early apocalypses, the canonical apocalypses, the Enochic apocalypses, etc. If one wishes to describe something as apocalyptic, it should be demonstrably typical of the appropriately defined and qualified set of texts.

Finally, a definition should provide a standard by which variation can be measured, or as Collins has stated, “A definition, then, serves not only to identify the common elements, but also to provide a foil against which the variations in particular works can be highlighted.”<sup>147</sup> The ideal of a precise class is not confounded by the existence of marginal cases. Rather, it is precisely the precision of the class that allows one to state clearly what is typical and variant about the use of a genre in a particular text. Only after defining the genre apocalypse and the basis for establishing the apocalyptic

---

<sup>145</sup> Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 10.

<sup>146</sup> James Barr makes this point with an example from Jürgen Moltmann, “... while apocalyptic does conceive its eschatology in cosmological terms, yet that is not the end of eschatology, but the beginning of an eschatological cosmology or an eschatological ontology for which being becomes historic and the cosmos opens itself to the apocalyptic process...” Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” 31.

<sup>147</sup> Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 19.

worldview can one meaningfully make an observation such as, “the sectarians at Qumran appear to have held an apocalyptic worldview but to have produced no apocalypses of their own.”<sup>148</sup> The existence of works that make use of more than one genre does not refute the possibility of defining a genre. On the contrary, defining each of two overlapping classes allows one to describe the overlap meaningfully.

### 2.2.3. The *Semeia* 14 definition

The Apocalypse Group of the Society of Biblical Literature’s Genres Project was active from about 1975 to 1978 and consisted of Harold W. Attridge, Francis T. Fallon, Anthony J. Saldarini, Adela Yarbro Collins, and was chaired by John J. Collins.<sup>149</sup> The work of this group was published in *Semeia* 14, with an introduction by John J. Collins which included a “master paradigm” that described significant features, a delineation of types and sub-types, and most importantly, a literary definition of the genre:

The common core of constant elements permits us, then, to formulate a comprehensive definition of the genre: “Apocalypse” is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> John J. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 428.

<sup>149</sup> Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction,” *Semeia* 36 (1986): 1.

<sup>150</sup> Emphasis removed. John J. Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” *Ibid.* 14 (1979): 9.

Some of the resistance discussed in the next section leads to some worthwhile clarifications, but this definition achieves the purpose of the definition just outlined and has become widely accepted.<sup>151</sup>

The definition follows the concept of genre discussed above, and pursues the aim to base terminology in the explicit features of the preserved texts. It builds on the distinction between genre, worldview and sociological setting. It takes a synchronic phenomenological approach to identifying what is constant in the genre in late antiquity. The method is inductive in that it begins with a generally accepted list of apocalypses and then identifies the common elements. The definition states no more than is true of all the apocalypses, and no more than is necessary to distinguish them as a class. It is possible that more can be true of all the apocalypses than is listed in the definition of the morphology of the genre. The definitive elements are distinct, however, in two criteria. First, Collins maintains that the definition has an “inner coherence.” This contrasts, for example, with approaches to definition that include elements that might be called superficial coincidences, such as “the catchword glory,”<sup>152</sup> or “autobiographical in form.”<sup>153</sup> Even if it were true that all known apocalypses use these forms, it is hard to imagine that if a text were newly discovered that resembled the apocalypses in all other ways, then it would be classified as a non-apocalypse on this basis alone. At risk of reverting to subjective assertions of what is essential about the apocalypses, the criterion

---

<sup>151</sup> Resistance can be found in as much as scholars avoid or implicitly deny the need for a literary definition of the genre, but it can at least be maintained that no alternative literary definition of the genre has gained greater acceptance.

<sup>152</sup> Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 32.

<sup>153</sup> Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 86.



of inner coherence moderates the limitations of the inductive method, such that we can reasonably expect to be able to classify new discoveries with this definition. Inner coherence also facilitates the study of the typically implicit worldview.

The other criterion balances in the other direction. To the extent possible, the definition uses elements that are explicitly present in the texts,<sup>154</sup> and least likely to remain subject to scholarly intuition, speculation and reconstruction. The extent to which that is possible is limited by the need to assemble enough common elements to distinguish the corpus. Jean Carmignac, for example, remains even more firmly grounded in objective forms, but does not succeed in producing a definition that distinguishes the genre from the symbolic visions of Jacob and Joseph in the Book of Genesis.<sup>155</sup> The *Semeia* 14 definition includes both literary form (the narrative framework) and literary contents (the transcendent reality disclosed within the framework). The relatively explicit literary contents are not to be mistaken for the contents of the implied worldview, however. As far as literary contents are concerned, temporal and spatial transcendence are reasonably unmistakable, even if they are general as such and can take a number of forms. At least as far as the present study is concerned, there is no real doubt that temporal and spatial transcendence can be found in Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. Thus, if we think of form and content as a continuum, the *Semeia* 14 definition starts with the most formal elements that are true and distinctive of all the apocalypses and proceeds into content only as far as is necessary to distinguish precisely

---

<sup>154</sup> John J. Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," *Ibid.* 14 (1979): 2.

<sup>155</sup> Carmignac admits that these meet his definition, dismissing them only in that they are too short to be called apocalypses. Carmignac, "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament," 169.

the borders of the classification. If more speculative elements turn out to be true of all the apocalypses (and it would certainly be worth studying), they would nevertheless remain unnecessary for the minimal purpose of a definition of a genre considered here.<sup>156</sup>

#### 2.2.4. Resistance and clarifications

Much of the response to the *Semeia* 14 definition runs along the lines of complaints and desiderata for what it did not try to do, or for not going far enough in describing and explaining the apocalypses. If we keep in mind the purpose of a definition, and understand that definition and description are not mutually exclusive, these ideas can be seen as complementing, rather than undermining, the *Semeia* 14 definition. Some points legitimately need to be taken into account as clarifications and reminders that much more needs to be studied than the generic classification. After evaluating the perceived conflict between definition and description, we will consider four basic responses: the desire to say more, the desire to say less, the resistance to the creation of artificial boundaries, and the push for a diachronic or evolutionary approach even at the level of definition of terminology. The following sub-section will treat the function amendment.

---

<sup>156</sup> We shall discuss below *Semeia* 36 and the function amendment. Although the larger sense of a literary genre can include literary function, function and the intent of the author are inherently more speculative than the elements treated in *Semeia* 14, and the classification of texts does not change with the amendment. We will therefore conclude that the amendment is not necessary for the literary definition of the genre.

#### 2.2.4.1. The supposed exclusivity between definition and description

While scholarly consensus rarely comes down to a vote, that is apparently what happened at the end of the Uppsala colloquium. The ayes went to “*contra definitionem, pro descriptione*.” In his introduction to the published volume, Hellholm notes the multiplicity of definitions offered and interprets the conflict as “a clear indication of the necessity for a hermeneutic mediation between *inductive* and *deductive* methods also in the area of apocalyptic research.”<sup>157</sup> In a retrospective near the ten year anniversary of the colloquium Collins said of the vote,

This did not represent a consensus on proper procedure, but was an expression of fatigue and a recognition that much more time would be needed to mediate the differing viewpoints. The final resolution was a diplomatic evasion of the issue at the end of a very stimulating, but exhausting, conference.<sup>158</sup>

For what the perspective of someone who was not able to pronounce “apocalypticism” in 1979 may be worth, it seems that the vote also took place at the end of a very stimulating but exhausting decade, one in which much work was duplicated. Although *Semeia* 14 had apparently been published before the Uppsala Colloquium (August 12-17, 1979), it is equally apparent that many participants already had their conceptions and definitions fixed. It can hardly be surprising that no one definition gained immediate consensus.

What may be surprising is that “definition” and “description” appear as mutually exclusive, such that “*pro descriptione*” has anything to do with “*contra definitionem*.” Perhaps “*iam descriptio, nondum definitio*” would have been more appropriate. Although

---

<sup>157</sup> Emphasis original. David Hellholm, “Introduction,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 2.

<sup>158</sup> Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 12.

this argument is not frequently made, Tigchelaar expresses an opposition to definitions when he says,

A definition is not a prerequisite for historical studies, and might even prove to be an impediment.... Description... clears the way for a better understanding of the historical complexity and variety one encounters in the texts freely labeled apocalyptic.<sup>159</sup>

Tigchelaar does admit that the *Semeia* 14 definition, “enables us to see more clearly the variations.”<sup>160</sup> Although the purpose of a literary definition of a genre as considered here has certain limitations, when those limitations are clearly recognized Tigchelaar’s fear seems undue.

#### 2.2.4.2. The desire to say more

Much of the critical response to the *Semeia* 14 definition seeks a definition that says more about the apocalypses. Although it is possible that more can be found to be always true of the apocalypses than the minimal definition of the genre, saying more usually results in excluding texts or crippling the usefulness as a definition with words like “often” and “sometimes.” The desire to say more comes in three basic forms. The first two overlap with what has already been addressed.

The first form of desire to say more relates to what has already been said about the distinction between definition and description. Much more can be said as description, but not definition. John Collins distinguished the frequent characteristics of the “master

---

<sup>159</sup> Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” 144.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.: 142.

paradigm” from the definitive characteristics which are always true.<sup>161</sup> Following the “*contra definitionem pro descriptione*” sentiment at Uppsala, Stegemann added an afterword describing frequent characteristics beyond his definition.<sup>162</sup> The *Semeia* 14 definition does not explain everything about the apocalypses. Many significant characteristics are “sometimes” or “often” true, and can certainly be legitimately studied. The family resemblance model, again, would be justified only if it were truly impossible to distinguish the genre based on features that are always true. The master paradigm and the various lists of characteristics are valuable as descriptions, not definitions.

The second form of desire to say more relates to what has already been said about the distinction between the apocalyptic worldview and the genre “apocalypse.” Richard Sturm, for example, fears that defining the genre morphologically threatens to reduce a century and a half of scholarship on “apocalyptic” to the literary genre of a few texts. Sturm favors the view of “apocalyptic” as a theological concept, and fears that a focus on the genre will exclude the possibility of speaking of apocalyptic thought in Paul, for example. Sturm’s concern about Paul is comparable to the discussion of the sectarian literature at Qumran, and warrants clarification. Although Stegemann and Carmignac sought to exclude the sectarian texts found at Qumran from the discussion of the apocalyptic worldview, Collins recognizes that the worldview implied in the genre can be expressed in other genres.<sup>163</sup> We should answer Sturm’s question, “If one approaches

---

<sup>161</sup> Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 8-9.

<sup>162</sup> Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 526.

<sup>163</sup> Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 3-33. Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 496-530. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 403-430.

apocalyptic primarily as a literary genre, must persons who did not write apocalypses, like Jesus or Paul, be neglected or ignored?”<sup>164</sup> The short answer is clearly “not at all,” but we might also add that clarity could follow from a well defined standard for comparison. To the extent that the worldview of Paul is typical also of the apocalypses, one can still use the adjective “apocalyptic” to describe his worldview. To the extent of the variation or uniqueness of Paul’s thought, a more specific qualifier might serve better. The literary definition of the genre provides a standard of a corpus of texts by which features can be identified as typical or variant; it does not limit the study of what is typical and variant in a text.

The third form of desire to say more pursues a focus on sub-genres or a more narrow classification. The genre does indeed cover a great area, a long period, and a diversity of theological tendencies. More can said if one claims what is true of fewer texts. In *Semeia* 14, Collins described two sub-genres, the heavenly journey and the historical apocalypses, but found coherence between them in that they both have some degree of spatial and temporal transcendence.<sup>165</sup> Martha Himmelfarb emphasized the coherence of the sub-genres, and the differences between them, concluding that they should be considered originally separate genres.<sup>166</sup> Indeed, more could be said if one were speaking only for one sub-genre or the other. For the purposes of the present study, Jubilees can fruitfully be compared to both cosmic-journey and historical apocalypses,

---

<sup>164</sup> Sturm, “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’,” 25.

<sup>165</sup> Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 16.

<sup>166</sup> Martha Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 60 n. 68. Collins discusses Himmelfarb’s points sympathetically in Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 11-32. and Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 13.

and represents at least one case for treating the two sub-genres together under the classification “apocalypses.” *Semeia* 36 will be primarily of interest to us in the following sub-section on the function amendment, but these essays also pursued what is generic about individual texts or smaller sets of texts.<sup>167</sup> Focusing only on the Apocalypse of John and the Shepherd of Hermas, David Hellholm finds an intriguing pattern that the central revelatory message constitutes a literary climax.<sup>168</sup> Although Hellholm elaborates a complicated methodology in the interest of taking some of the subjectivity out of “central” and “climax,” by no means has this been proven true of all the apocalypses, and Aune shows that it is also true of a work that has not been considered an apocalypse.<sup>169</sup> We should pay particular attention to the qualifier of Aune’s proposed definition, “with special reference to the Apocalypse of John.”<sup>170</sup> While the autobiographical form and literary climax may be patterns found in multiple apocalypses, these characteristics can not be considered definitive of all the apocalypses. Perhaps different sub-genres or sub-sub-genres remain to be defined, but saying much more than the *Semeia* 14 definition is unlikely to speak for all the apocalypses.

---

<sup>167</sup> Collins, “Introduction,” 2.

<sup>168</sup> David Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” *Ibid.*: 53. See also Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 73.

<sup>169</sup> Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 74. One might also consider the “inner coherence” issue. Would one say a text is necessarily not an apocalypse if it resembles the apocalypses in all ways but this?

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*: 86.

#### 2.2.4.3. The desire to say less

A number of critiques and proposed definitions attempt to say less, either to focus on a more “essential” theme, remain more formally objective, or remain closer to the etymological origins of “uncovering.” As noble as these intentions may be, they fail to distinguish the apocalypses from the super-category of revelatory literature. The proposals of Stegemann, Carmignac, Sanders and Rowland should each be considered. All of these avoid any implication of eschatology. Although previous scholars erred more in the opposite direction by identifying a very particular understanding of eschatology as the principal and definitive concern of apocalypses and apocalyptic thought, the eradication of any sense of eschatology, personal or otherwise, is an overreaction.

Hartmut Stegemann proposed the strongest and most interesting of the alternative definitions. Sticking to the etymological sense of ἀποκάλυψις, his definition focuses on particularities of the “uncovering” that distinguish the apocalypses from other revelatory literature. Although he defines eschatology particularly narrowly (to avoid personal or realized eschatology), one can see the advantage of defining the genre without approaching the muddy topic of eschatology. Stegemann begins by defining revelatory literature more broadly,

Mit “Apokalyptik” bezeichne ich ausschließlich ein *literarisches* Phänomen, nämlich die Anfertigung von “Offenbarungsschriften”, die Sachverhalte “enthüllen”, die sich nicht aus innerweltlichen Gegebenheiten, beispielsweise aus dem vorgegebenen “Erfahrungswissen” ableiten lassen, sondern die sich dem Autor und dem Leser nur erschließen durch den Rückgriff auf “himmlisches Offenbarungswissen”.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 498. “By ‘Apocalyptic’ I mean exclusively a literary phenomenon, namely, the preparation of ‘revelatory writings’ which ‘reveal’ circumstances, not from worldly conditions, for example those which can be derived from



Thus far Stegemann does not claim to distinguish the apocalypses, but rather says in detail what *Semeia* 14 says briefly with, “a genre of revelatory literature.” The attempt to distinguish the apocalypses within the revelatory literature follows,

Nicht jede Mitteilung “himmlischer Geheimnisse” freilich ist damit zugleich auch bereits “Apokalyptik”, ebensowenig jede einzelne “Enthüllung” von Aspekten, deren rechtes Verständnis anderen Menschen verborgen ist. Sondern bei “apokalyptischer Literatur” muß es sich schon um ein regelrechtes Buch handeln, das speziell zu dem Zweck abgefaßt worden ist, “himmlisches Geheimwissen” bewußt als solches zu traktieren und es dennoch einem bestimmten Leserkreis zu “offenbaren”.<sup>172</sup>

Indeed, the “reveal-conceal dialectic”<sup>173</sup> is an important feature for the view of revelation to be discussed in Chapter 4. The problem is only with the functionality of this insight for the purposes of defining a genre. In evading the mud-puddle of eschatology Stegemann leaped into the murky depths of authorial intent (*bewußt*, *Absicht* in the next sentence) and reconstructed original audience (*Leserkreis*). Although Stegemann strongly denies the possibility of defining “apocalyptic” as a *Gattung*,<sup>174</sup> he here wanders from basing his definition on explicit literary features. In fact, the “reveal-conceal dialectic” belongs more properly to a consideration of the worldview, and could easily spread into reconstructed sociological setting. One should also keep in mind William Adler’s case for

---

purported ‘know-how’, but are only opened for the author and the reader by resort to ‘heavenly revealed knowledge’.”

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 498-499. “To be sure, not every communication of ‘heavenly mysteries’ is therefore at the same time also ‘Apocalyptic’, nor every individual ‘unveiling’ of aspects whose right understanding is hidden to other people. But by ‘apocalyptic literature’ it must concern a proper book, that is written specially for the purpose, consciously so as to conceal ‘heavenly mysteries’ and yet to ‘reveal’ to a certain circle of readers.”

<sup>173</sup> This phrase is used by Aune for the same basic idea. Aune, “The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre,” 84.

<sup>174</sup> Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” 499, 527 n. 107.

not taking at face value “esotericism as a literary motif.”<sup>175</sup> Less importantly but also worth noting, Stegemann raises more problems than he solves by limiting the genre to “ein regelrechtes Buch.” A definition should be able to handle (without simply excluding) works which I prefer to call “making use of more than one genre,” which have previously been called, “mixed genres” or “mixed affinities.” Furthermore, the implied contrast with “wisdom” creates problems already in Sirach, where one might find elite revealed wisdom that meets Stegemann’s definition.<sup>176</sup> Of course the close relationship between apocalypses and wisdom literature should be studied, but it can be studied more clearly if one begins with distinctive terminology. Stegemann’s insight contributes to the study of the apocalypses, but he does not provide the most efficient definition available.

As already mentioned, Jean Carmignac promotes a “scientific” definition based only on the most explicit formal criteria. Following Gammie, he also rejects the importance of eschatology in the apocalypses, and rightly rejects the possibility of defining the genre on the basis of a definitive element of the worldview. Carmignac proposes a few variations on his definition, but none suffices to distinguish the apocalypses in a rigorous way from other forms of revelatory literature. Carmignac first proposes the definition,

Genre littéraire qui présente, à travers des symboles typiques, des révélations soit sur Dieu, soit sur anges ou les démons, soit sur leurs partisans, soit sur les instruments de leur action.<sup>177</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> Adler, “Introduction,” 13ff.

<sup>176</sup> Randal A. Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 8 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), 91-95.

<sup>177</sup> Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 20.

To this he adds, “Car c’est le rapport du monde visible avec le monde invisible qui est l’objet propre de l’Apocalyptique.”<sup>178</sup> In a postscript to the same work Carmignac comments on the *Semeia* 14 definition, rejecting the last part of the definition, “which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another supernatural world.”<sup>179</sup> At Uppsala, Carmignac proposed a more succinct version, “Genre littéraire qui décrit des révélations célestes à travers des symboles.”<sup>180</sup>

The main issue with Carmignac’s definitions is that they do not rigorously distinguish the apocalypses as they have been traditionally understood (as disputed as that may be) from a great deal of prophetic literature and even from the dreams of Jacob and Joseph in Genesis.<sup>181</sup> In response to the last example, Carmignac says simply that “Certes, ces songes sont exprimés en des récits trop courts pour qu’on ose leur décerner le titre ‘d’Apocalypses’.”<sup>182</sup> Rather than applying his scientific standards to defining how short an apocalypse can be and still be an apocalypse, Carmignac continues by hypothesizing that one finds in these dream narratives the origin of the apocalypses. Carmignac does not insist, as does Stegemann, that an apocalypse must be a complete work composed with a certain intent, or even that it have a narrative framework,<sup>183</sup> but

---

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.: 21.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.: 33.

<sup>180</sup> Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” 165.

<sup>181</sup> Recently, however, Frances Flannery-Dailey has returned approvingly to Carmignac’s suggestion that the apocalyptic worldview originates in the dream tradition reflected in Joseph’s dreams in Genesis. Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 276. Flannery-Dailey, “Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature,” 240 n. 30.

<sup>182</sup> Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” 169.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., 165 n. 8.

perhaps it would be an improvement. Whatever clarity Carmignac gains by avoiding eschatology, he loses in trying to distinguish the allegorical visions of prophets such as Ezekiel from the symbolic revelations of the apocalypses.<sup>184</sup>

Carmignac's proposal to cut short the *Semeia* 14 definition warrants comment as well. Carmignac is not necessarily wrong to point out that eschatology ventures from the strictly explicit formal features in the direction of content, but in practice it is not too difficult to determine if a text mentions the issue of eschatology, especially if one brackets the question of what the text says about it. Temporal transcendence can take various forms, including a view from the beginning, a view from the end, or arguably just a particularly structured view. As Collins has made clear, eschatological salvation can include personal eschatology.<sup>185</sup> With these clarifications, temporal transcendence can be assigned to the relatively explicit literary features, with the theological implications left to the worldview. Carmignac apparently omits the spatial transcendence only for the sake of brevity, since it overlaps with his inclusion of the partisans and instruments of the invisible world. While temporal transcendence is not the sole definitive feature of the apocalypses, this element cannot be omitted without the classification collapsing onto adjacent revelatory literature.

Sanders and Rowland propose definitions that are not so much alternatives to the *Semeia* 14 definition as alternatives to the idea of defining the genre in a rigorous way. Sanders proposes what he calls "the essentialist definition," around the combination of

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 166-169, particularly 168.

<sup>185</sup> Collins, "Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism," 16. Also, Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," 89.

the themes of revelation and reversal.<sup>186</sup> He identifies the essentialist definition with the traditional definition because, although it involves significant subjectivity, it attempts to get at the heart of what motivated the composition of apocalypses and how they function. He sees in the apocalypses social realities, “even if they do not constitute one tightly defined literary genre.”<sup>187</sup> In effect, Sanders questions whether the study of Jewish apocalyptic literature really improved in the 1970s with the contributions of Koch, Stone, Hanson and Collins. Rather than reviewing the previous section in which I conclude otherwise, let us ask simply whether the essentialist definition meets the purpose of a definition discussed above, to distinguish a body of literature. Sanders asserts that, “the themes of revelation and reversal, when the reversal has to do with a group—either Israel or the righteous—are in all the works being discussed; and in that combination they are in no others.” I have found no publications that second this claim, and some that find this combination widely in the prophetic literature.<sup>188</sup>

Although Christopher Rowland’s revised dissertation was published in 1982, it is important to keep in mind what Rowland says in his preface, “This book was completed in January 1979, and only one or two additions have been made to it since then.”<sup>189</sup> Thus, Rowland’s work must be the last monograph completed independent of the influence of *Semeia* 14, Jean Carmignac’s essay, and the Uppsala colloquium.<sup>190</sup> Rowland

---

<sup>186</sup> Sanders, “The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses,” 456-458.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., 458.

<sup>188</sup> Collins, “Introduction,” 2. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 9-10.

<sup>189</sup> Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, ix.

<sup>190</sup> For other influential articles see Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 11. Gruenwald’s *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* was completed in 1977. Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, Bd. 14 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), xi.

distinguishes the apocalyptic worldview from the genre “apocalypse,” which he defines as revelation in a threefold structure of legends, vision, and admonitions.<sup>191</sup> His major point, however, is not that this structure is true of all the apocalypses and distinguishes them from other works, as is the purpose of a definition treated above, but that “a definition of apocalyptic should not be too restricted but attempt to do justice to all the various elements in the literature.”<sup>192</sup> In particular he wishes to deemphasize eschatology, and generally emphasizes the diversity of modes and content.<sup>193</sup> He correctly dismisses some older notions, particularly that apocalyptic represents a cohesive religious system and contrasts starkly with rabbinic thought.<sup>194</sup> Like Sanders, however, Rowland is interested in what is essentially true, and not what is true of the entirety of a distinctive classification, “apocalyptic seems essentially to be about the revelation of the divine mysteries through visions or some other form of immediate disclosure of heavenly truths.” Perhaps we should not be overconfident with our definitions and classifications, but neither should we abandon hope for precise definitions as tools for further study.<sup>195</sup> Rowland’s resistance to a strict definition will lead us to our next sub-sub-section, the fear that the definition of the literary genre produces new canons and artificial boundaries.

---

<sup>191</sup> Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 50. Significantly for the following chapters, Rowland notes that Jubilees fits the formal structure even though its contents do not seem apocalyptic. However, Rowland and I are operating with very different definitions of the genre.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., 48, 72.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., 71.

<sup>195</sup> The definition of the genre is not an end in itself. “Genres have to do with identifying and communicating rather than defining and classifying.” Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 38.

#### 2.2.4.4. The resistance to artificial boundaries

In a sense the push for definitions in the 1970s began with Klaus Koch's call for precise and consistent use of terminology. Precise classification and clear boundaries have the *potential* to create artificial canons in scholarship and isolate specializations from relevant context.<sup>196</sup> The danger is worth keeping in mind, and we will not argue that it has never occurred. We will be clear, however, that *Semeia* 14 states that this should not be the case, and point out briefly how John Collins, for example, has used the definition in the past not to create boundaries, but describe relationships. *Semeia* 14 includes as "extremely important" the "related literary categories, such as oracles, testaments and revelatory dialogues."<sup>197</sup> Collins' recognition of the link between wisdom literature and the apocalypses can be seen even before *Semeia* 14 in 1975.<sup>198</sup> The application of definition and typology can be seen more fully developed in "Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility."<sup>199</sup> It is precisely the replacement of "impressions" with definitions of wisdom and apocalyptic that makes possible the recognition of compatibility. One need hardly continue with other examples, such as the

---

<sup>196</sup> It has also been suggested that the very notion of genre is an artificial boundary. It is certainly true that not all literature observes the strict boundaries of the Aristotelian model of genre, but current genre theory, using cognition theory, recognizes that categories are fundamental to articulation and perception, and that necessary defining features exist. The key is not to stop there. A morphological definition does not prohibit further discussion of *how* the literary morphology is used, or on what levels a work can be typical. It helps to speak of "use of" or "participation in" a genre, rather than membership in an absolute sense. See page 4, note 1 above.

<sup>197</sup> Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," 18.

<sup>198</sup> John J. Collins, "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *JBL* 94 (1975): 218-234. Von Rad made a similar connection, and a divorce from prophecy, on the basis of theological conceptions of history.

<sup>199</sup> Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," 165-185.

treatment of 4QInstruction by Collins and his student Matthew Goff,<sup>200</sup> to recognize that generic definition need not carry with it “ideals of generic purity.”<sup>201</sup>

#### 2.2.4.5. The push for a diachronic definition

*Semeia* 14 focused on “phenomenological similarity, not historical derivation.”<sup>202</sup>

It did not deny the importance of the historical dimension for the study of the genre, it merely claimed that the recurring literary characteristics could be defined independently. The definition of the genre states what is typical of all apocalypses; it does not claim how it became typical or chart the development of internal specifics. Both synchronic definition and diachronic analysis are valid. García Martínez and Tigchelaar dispute, however, Collins’ claim that literary description and identification are logically prior to study of the history and social function.<sup>203</sup> We have already seen the diachronic emphasis in Gunkel’s concept of *Gattung*, but a more immediate source is to be found in Fowler’s “life and death” or “evolutionary” models of generic development.<sup>204</sup> Although

---

<sup>200</sup> John J. Collins, “The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium; 168 (Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003), 287-305. Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, STDJ 50 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003).

<sup>201</sup> Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” 404.

<sup>202</sup> Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 1.

<sup>203</sup> Florentino García Martínez, “Encore l’apocalyptique,” *JSJ* 17 (1986): 224-232. Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” 137-144.

<sup>204</sup> As we have already seen, Fowler rejects the very possibility of definition of a genre and the purpose of a definition of a genre described above. While it may be true that the *Semeia* 14 definition does not tell us everything we would like to know about what is typical of the apocalypses, diachronically or synchronically, it does succeed in establishing a classification. It should be added that if the biological analogies of genres (life and death, or evolution) are not fundamentally flawed, they at least lend themselves to being taken too far. I have not seen the biological analogy successfully applied to the



chronological specificity will be important in our subsequent consideration of the worldview typical of the apocalypses, a “minimalist” definition of a literary genre as here conceived can and should focus on what is true of all the apocalypses in antiquity. Direct influence between writers is worth studying, but delves into more speculative elements, including sociological setting. Just as more can be said of a sub-genre, more can be said of the apocalypses at any one “stage,” but a broad morphology of all the apocalypses remains valid.

#### 2.2.5. The function amendment

A complete understanding of genre includes not only its form and contents, but also its literary function. In 1986 *Semeia* 36 proposed a number of amendments to the morphological definition of *Semeia* 14 in order to account for function.<sup>205</sup> Function cannot be disregarded, but it can be separated in the logical sequence of study. For the

---

apocalypses. Fowler’s own list of qualifications could be read as reasons to abandon the analogy. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 42-43. See also, Alastair Fowler, “The Life and Death of Literary Forms,” *New Literary History* 2 (1971): 199-216.

<sup>205</sup> *Semeia* 36 illustrated the difficulty in defining the function of the genre “apocalypse,” but did not arrive at a clear consensus. David Aune, David Hellholm, and Adela Yarbro Collins proposed different statements of function. John Collins accepted statements of function to varying degrees. Already in 1982 Collins accepted the basic proposal of the literary function of illocution, and expanded on the basis of the *Semeia* 14 definition. John J. Collins, “The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 93, 110. In the first edition of *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (1984), Collins discussed an earlier iteration of Hellholm’s proposal and proposed his own formulation, “The function of the apocalyptic literature is to shape one’s imaginative perception of a situation and so lay the basis for whatever course of action it exhorts.” John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 32. The second edition updates the footnotes to reflect *Semeia* 36 but maintains the same position. In 1989 (published 1991) John Collins accepted the function proposed by Adela Yarbro Collins with emphasis that, “social setting cannot be inferred from literary genre, which can accommodate multiple social settings.” Collins, “Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” 19.

preliminary stage of defining use of the genre, the *Semeia* 14 definition stands without need for amendment.

Although it is possible to speak of literary function of a genre while maintaining a clear separation from authorial intent, worldview and social setting, it is not trivial to do so.<sup>206</sup> If one further seeks to maintain the standards of the *Semeia* 14 definition by stating what is true of all the apocalypses, then it becomes extremely difficult to make definitive statements of the function for the genre.<sup>207</sup> The most successful statements of function rely on the principle of illocution. For example, it seems to follow from the morphological element of the spatial axis that apocalypses interpret earthly circumstances

---

<sup>206</sup> While the sociological function depends on a reconstructed *Sitz im Leben*, a literary function adheres closely to the explicit features of the texts. Although the insistence that a statement of function is indispensable to a definition of a genre at first seems to revive the theory of *Gattung* promoted by Hermann Gunkel, both David Aune and David Hellholm distinguish sociological function from literary function.

David Aune in particular emphasizes this point, "In most discussions of the function of apocalyptic literature, the notion of 'function' is frequently understood, explicitly or implicitly, as 'social function,' i.e., as a quest for the original *Sitz im Leben*, or life setting of apocalypses. Apocalypses are often, and not incorrectly, understood as a form of protest literature in which the oppressed rights of a minority are legitimated by divine revelation. Yet it is precisely this aspect of apocalyptic literature [that is] most often hidden from the view of modern scholars and in many cases irrecoverable. The concept 'function,' however, has many meanings, necessitating a distinction between *literary* function and *social* function (J. J. Collins, 1982:92-94, 110-11)." Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," 89. In the work to which Aune refers, Collins does not use the terms literary or social function, but does make the same basic distinction, "Despite the uncertainty of *Sitz im Leben*, the function of the Book of Watchers can be seen to a considerable extent from its internal structure. Here we can speak with L. Hartman of the illocution of a text... It seems safe to say that consolation and exhortation are typical illocutions of apocalypses." Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique," 110. Collins also finds implicit in the *Semeia* 14 definition, "the transposition of the frame of reference." Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique," 111. See also, Hartman, "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre," 334.

Hellholm describes a matrix by which the distinction between form, content and function is valid at all levels of abstraction. Thus, Hellholm suggests that the literary genre has form, content and function, and *Sitz im Leben* has its own form, content and function. Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," 13-64.

<sup>207</sup> Aune frames his definition, "with special reference to the Apocalypse of John," and Adela Yarbro Collins, already in the introduction to *Semeia* 36, pointed out how Aune's definition does not apply to all the apocalypses. Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," 86. Collins, "Introduction," 4, 7.

in light of the supernatural world, and from the temporal axis that they interpret present circumstances in light of the future.<sup>208</sup> Even to the extent to which these implications are true, they do not go very far to distinguish the apocalypses.<sup>209</sup> Again, however, the possibility of irony limits how absolutely we can establish even the most basic implications.<sup>210</sup> It is one thing to say that the form and contents of the genre typically imply a certain function, but does it follow that they always do? How should one describe a text that uses typical form and contents towards an atypical function? If a parody news show uses the genre “evening news” ironically, does that mean it does not use the genre?

One might answer “yes” in the sense that ironic and non-ironic use of the genre, with their different functions, should be considered different genres. This is where I find it helpful to say not that a show *is* the evening news or Jubilees *is* an apocalypse, but that they *make use* of genres in a certain way that requires further comment.<sup>211</sup> They are not “exemplary cases” of the genre, and they do not function typically, yet they cannot be understood properly without reference both to the genre that they use and how they use it. When I argue that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse,” I mean only that it uses the

---

<sup>208</sup> Adela Yarbro Collins’ function amendment builds on the immediate implications of the *Semeia* 14 definition also in that “by means of divine authority” follows from the revelatory framework, “... intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.” Collins, “Introduction,” 7.

<sup>209</sup> Hellholm adds, “Intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation.” This statement is both speculative and vague. If we leave open how the group is defined and by what measure the crisis is perceived, it is hard to imagine what Jewish literature of the second temple period would be clearly excluded. David Hellholm, “The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John,” *Ibid.*: 27.

<sup>210</sup> For example, one might conclude that a person who speaks in a serious tone of voice (form) and says “I’m completely serious” (content) *intends* to be taken seriously (function). However, the ironic use of seriousness in stand-up comedy is practically a staple.

<sup>211</sup> See page 4, note 1 above.

morphology of the genre, and consider the question of whether it functions typically or atypically to be a separate and logically posterior question. *Semeia* 14 provides a satisfactory basis for identifying the use of the genre. *Semeia* 36 contributes insight into the function implied in the illocution of the genre. For the purposes of this dissertation, the more basic function of the genre “apocalypse” is to create reader expectations of the worldview typically conveyed by the apocalypses.

#### 2.2.6. Prototype theory

Disciplinary specialization has often isolated scholars of biblical literature from scholars of literary theory. One recent exception is Carol Newsom’s article on the literary genre “apocalypse” in light of developments in genre theory, particularly prototype theory. As Newsom points out, *Semeia* 14 seems to anticipate several of the insights that later gained traction among more general studies of genre: *Semeia* 14 began with mutually agreeable prototypes and from there studied what is typical of them; *Semeia* 14’s “inner-coherence” resembles the “gestalt notion;” *Semeia* 14’s phenomenological approach anticipates the point that a reader’s use of a genre does not presume knowledge of the history and evolution of the genre.<sup>212</sup> Prototype theory is particularly useful in breaking down the binary and exclusive view of genre classification as an end in itself. Thus, a case like Jubilees is a problem for a narrow approach to genre classification, whereas prototype theory brings a different set of questions. Namely, how is Jubilees like and unlike apocalypses that are more readily recognized as such? Prototype theory does

---

<sup>212</sup> Newsom, “Spying out the Land,” 443-445.

not replace precision concerning particular aspects that can be typical in literature, including literary morphology and worldview. Rather, it is a different way of saying that typical elements can be used in atypical ways. Again, the question is not whether Jubilees is an apocalypse, but how Jubilees uses the literary genre.<sup>213</sup>

The prototype model developed as a correction to the family resemblance model. John Swales illustrated how “a family resemblance theory can make anything resemble anything.”<sup>214</sup> David Fishelov criticized the family resemblance model as an overused escape from the despair of finding fundamental common features.<sup>215</sup> Fishelov does not address apocalypses in particular, but he does use “sonnet” to illustrate the point that sometimes a genre can be very clearly defined according to fixed morphological features, even if the holistic study of a genre would also include the complete cluster of formal, stylistic, and thematic features.<sup>216</sup> Only sometimes is it not possible to define a genre based on always-present features, but Fishelov argues that it usually is possible to find necessary conditions at some level. Fishelov acknowledges the importance of the “additional cluster of characteristics that is dynamic and variable.”<sup>217</sup> Building on Fishelov, Sinding outlined a hierarchy of necessary, default, and optional features.<sup>218</sup> The

---

<sup>213</sup> Above, page 4.

<sup>214</sup> John Swales, *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 51.

<sup>215</sup> “I would like to suggest that Wittgenstein’s concept, at least in one of its interpretations, has perhaps become too fashionable, too little scrutinized. Instead of being a methodology of last resort, it has become the first and immediate refuge in the wake of disappointment with one or other rigid definition made up of a confined list of characteristics.” David Fishelov, *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993), 54, see also 66.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 8, 13-15.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>218</sup> Sinding, “After Definitions,” 200.

features together constitute a gestalt complex or schema.<sup>219</sup> Applied to apocalypses, it becomes clear that the study of the gestalt requires more than the *Semeia* 14 definition, but the morphological definition of the necessary literary components constitutes an important foundation.

Like the family resemblance model, the prototype model is often illustrated by analogy from the taxonomy of species. In the taxonomy of birds there is in fact a scientific definition of “birds” that is true of all birds. However, cognitive science (and common sense) shows that an eagle or robin is more readily recognized as a bird than a penguin or ostrich (at least in North America).<sup>220</sup> From the standpoint of human cognition, eagles and robins are prototypical whereas penguins and ostriches are not; they are more typical, or typical in more ways. The prototype model resembles the exemplary case model, but is rooted in cognitive science, rather than judgments of quality or direct influence (penguins are not poor imitations of eagles or evolved from eagles). The problem remains of deciding exactly what are the prototypes and what is prototypical about them, but we at least move beyond all-or-none expectations of taxonomy. Applied to the present work, Jubilees is a penguin. It fits the category at the level of literary genre, but does not “fly” at the level of worldview. In a sense the present work answers the question of prototype theory: how is Jubilees like the prototypical apocalypses, and how does it differ?

---

<sup>219</sup> Ibid.: 194-198.

<sup>220</sup> Swales, *Genre Analysis*, 51-52.

The first conclusion of *Semeia* 14 remains true today, “it is in fact possible to identify a coherent and recognizable literary genre, which may appropriately be labeled ‘apocalypse.’”<sup>221</sup> The definition of the literary genre succeeded in its goals of distinguishing a body of texts in which assertions could be grounded and variations measured, and it has not been surpassed. It does not tell us everything we would like to know about the apocalypses, but it does tell us what is and is not an apocalypse with the most objective possible criteria. More importantly, the definition builds on consistent and coherent patterns in the texts, and not on the intuition and reconstructions of modern scholars. Not only does the definition allow us to identify the use of the genre in the Book of Jubilees, it leaves us confident that the genre is not anachronistic, but communicated meaning in the ancient context. The definition also distinguishes literary genre from worldview and social setting. It allows us to distinguish the manner of communication from what is being communicated, and thus maintains the possibility of irony.

As we go on to compare Jubilees to contemporary apocalypses, the *Semeia* 14 definition will provide a three-part structure: revelation, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis. The principle of illocution leads us to expect that a worldview will be implicit in each of the three major parts of the definition of the genre. Additional insights can be incorporated into this structure.

---

<sup>221</sup> Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 18.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE TEXT OF THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

Before comparing Jubilees with contemporary apocalypses on views of revelation, the spatial axis and the temporal axis, we should clarify the extent to which we can assume the preservation, unity, and date of the Book of Jubilees. Each must be qualified to some extent, but we can be relatively confident with positive positions on all three issues. The manuscripts available preserve the book reasonably well. The work is a coherent composition, probably the work of a single author, and relatively free of insertions. The work can be dated relatively precisely to the years following 159 BCE.

Because the argument of this dissertation treats Jubilees in its historical context, it is essential that we consider carefully the reliability, unity and date of the text as we know it. Although the redaction and scribal history of a text can warrant study in its own right, we need to have a good idea whether a given passage, phrase or nuance stands in the literary context of the rest of the work, and what literature (and to a lesser extent, what events) can be treated as contemporary. To be clear, my argument is not that Jubilees was redacted from apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic sources, or that apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic passages were inserted into the work. In the broader strokes, this will become clear in the chapters on the elements of the genre and the worldview. It is precisely in the use of the genre “apocalypse” that Jubilees inverts the apocalyptic



worldview. On the level of genre and worldview, Jubilees 23 fits inseparably within the framework of the book as a whole. In this chapter we turn to a lower level of abstraction and address the possible protests against reading the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees as a unified composition from the mid-second century BCE.

### 3.1. The reliability of the texts available

With certain qualifications in mind, we can be reasonably confident in the manuscript traditions of Jubilees and the critical edition produced by James VanderKam in 1989.

The first qualification is that the work is preserved in its entirety only in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic version is itself a translation of a Greek translation of a Hebrew original.<sup>1</sup> Needless to say, the translation process can produce errors and flatten nuance in word choice. It is by no means trivial to reconstruct the Hebrew original or the Greek that can explain variants in Latin and Ethiopic.<sup>2</sup> One might also imagine that the Greek and Ethiopic versions of Genesis-Exodus influenced the translations into Greek and Ethiopic, respectively. In 1977 James VanderKam argued that this was not significantly the case.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Greek also served as the basis for a Latin translation partially preserved in one palimpsest. The book has also been translated from Hebrew into Syriac. Crislip suggests the possibility that the entire work was translated into Coptic, although only excerpts have been preserved. Andrew Crislip, "The *Book of Jubilees* in Coptic: An Early Christian *Florilegium* on Family of Noah," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 40 (2003): 40.

<sup>2</sup> The translations into Modern Hebrew by Goldman and Hartom do not claim to reconstruct the original, although they certainly can be helpful. M. Goldman, "ספר היובלים," in הספרים החיצונים, ed. Abraham Kahana (Jerusalem: Makor, 1978), 216-313. E. S. Hartom, "ספר היובלות," in הספרים החיצונים: ספורי אגדה (Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1965).

<sup>3</sup> James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 113, 116.

When Hebrew evidence is not available, and more than one Hebrew word could explain the preserved versions, we cannot safely argue from the details of word choice. Although there are times when we would certainly like to be more certain of the Hebrew original, the argument of this dissertation does not depend on a small number of words.

The second major qualification is that the oldest Ethiopic manuscript dates from the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>4</sup> Although many fragments from fourteen or fifteen ancient manuscripts were found at Qumran, they preserve a very small percentage of the text (words or letters from 215 of 1307 verses, or 16%).<sup>5</sup> A small but helpful paraphrase of Jubilees 10 is preserved as an introduction to the ספר נח published by Jellinek.<sup>6</sup> Additional Hebrew evidence exists but does not directly reflect a text of the Book of Jubilees.<sup>7</sup> The main contribution of the evidence from Qumran is to gauge the reliability of the Ethiopic and Latin manuscripts. Fortunately, the level of agreement is remarkably

---

<sup>4</sup> VanderKam dates it to the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Baars and Zuurmond to the 15<sup>th</sup>. James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2 vols. (Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989), 1.xv. W. Baars and R. Zuurmond, "The Project for a New Edition of the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 9 (1964): 72. VanderKam attributes his dates to R. Zuurmond, "Het oordeel over Kaïn in de oud-joodse traditie," *Amsterdamse cahiers voor exegese en bijbelse theologie* 3 (1982): 115 n. 18.

<sup>5</sup> Milik counts 15 by including 4Q217, which VanderKam excludes from his count of 14. James C. VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio C. Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 12 (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1992), 640. See also, James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 16.

<sup>6</sup> Adolph Jellinek, "ספר נח," in *בית המדרש* (Yerushalayim: Sifre Vahrmann, 1967), 155-160. The relevant portion is also printed as an appendix in R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906). A translation is given by Martha Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of Jubilees in Medieval Hebrew Literature," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 129-130.

<sup>7</sup> See VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.ix-xi. See also, Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of Jubilees," 115-141. William Adler, "Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 143-171.

high. On occasion, the Ethiopic tradition preserves a better text than some of the fragments at Qumran. For example, three instances of dittography appear in 4Q221.<sup>8</sup>

There is some danger of circular argumentation when dealing with a manuscript that could fit in Jubilees but does not match the Ethiopic text. It is theoretically possible that a small fragment reflects a different version of Jubilees but cannot be identified as a version of Jubilees because it is small and does not agree with the more complete versions. For example, Kister identifies 4Q176 fragment 21 as 29 letters of Jubilees 23:30-31. Among VanderKam's reasons for rejecting this identification is the lack of correspondence with the Ethiopic version.<sup>9</sup> Fortunately, the fragments which are large enough to identify with certainty as a version of Jubilees overwhelmingly agree with the later manuscripts. It should also be noted that "Pseudo-Jubilees" is not a version of Jubilees. If it depends on Jubilees at all it alters its source into a different kind of composition.<sup>10</sup> VanderKam speculates that Milik coined the term because, "the texts employ language that is familiar from and to some extent characteristic of *Jubilees*, but the documents themselves are not actual copies of Jubilees."<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 94. Also, James C. VanderKam and Jozef T. Milik, "Jubilees," in *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts Part 1*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, et al., DJD 13 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 65. Also, see below on 11QJubilees fragment 9.

<sup>9</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.ix. VanderKam discusses further evidence in VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," 639. For more on the criterion of agreement with the Ethiopic see VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," 643 n.2.

<sup>10</sup> James C. VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, ed. Shemaryahu Talmon, James A. Sanders, and Craig A. Evans, Biblical Interpretation Series 28 (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997), 261.

<sup>11</sup> VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees (DJD 13)," 142. See also, VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees," 242.

Even when we lack comparative evidence we can detect and sometimes correct corruptions in the Ethiopic, as VanderKam's notes illustrate. Textual problems as a result of scribal error are sadly inevitable, but we should distinguish scribal error from deliberate manipulation.<sup>12</sup> Fortunately, the former is reasonably limited (perhaps by virtue of the canonical status of Jubilees in the Ethiopian tradition<sup>13</sup>) and the latter is never more than speculative. Even when we have no help from the Qumran fragments or the Latin palimpsest, we can be reasonably confident in the textual tradition.

VanderKam's 1989 critical edition draws from 27 Ethiopic manuscripts, 15 of which were fully collated, the 15 Hebrew fragments available at that time, the Latin palimpsest edited by Ceriani, the fragments from the Greek and Syriac chronographers, and a number of other sources which attest the influence of the book but contribute less to textual studies. VanderKam's critical edition surpasses previous editions methodologically, in addition to the greater number of sources used. Although Charles' intuition was a remarkable tool, VanderKam verifies the relationship between text families with systematic analysis. He also quantifies the agreement of the Ethiopic manuscripts with the Hebrew fragments from Qumran to determine the preferred base text. Although the notes should always be consulted, VanderKam's edition also differs from prior editions in its reluctance to emend and reconstruct in the absence of textual evidence.

---

<sup>12</sup> The lacuna at Ethiopic Jubilees 13:25 in a passage on Melchizedek may at first appear to be a deliberate attempt to suppress something about a controversial biblical figure, but closer examination seems to suggest a simple scribal error in the major manuscript tradition. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.81.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.xviii.

Milik first asserted the reliability of the Ethiopic version in 1956, and subsequent discoveries qualify but do not negate his conclusion.<sup>14</sup> In 1977, based on 14 fragments from Qumran, VanderKam claimed, “It is clear that the best critical text which can be obtained from the Ethiopic manuscripts reproduces the Hebrew original with remarkable, though not complete precision.”<sup>15</sup> The Hebrew fragments that became available since 1977 call for only slightly further qualification of this statement. 4Q176 fragments 19-20 had actually been published in 1968, but were first identified as belonging to Jubilees in 1987. These 79 letters do not challenge the reliability of the Ethiopic tradition. In 1989 VanderKam could still safely conclude “the words and letters that have been made available demonstrate, when compared with the complete and much later Ethiopic version, that the text of the book has been preserved with great care across the centuries.”<sup>16</sup>

The next major publication of Jubilees fragments occurred in 1994 by VanderKam and Milik in DJD 13. Eight copies of Jubilees were published in their entirety (there had been various preliminary publications<sup>17</sup>). With more evidence came more variants, but VanderKam and Milik could still claim, “In most cases the surviving Hebrew words and the text that can be reconstructed around them show that the Ethiopic

---

<sup>14</sup> Jozef T. Milik, “Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran,” *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 60. See further, VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 637.

<sup>15</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 95.

<sup>16</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.xi.

<sup>17</sup> One fragment of 4Q221 had already been published in 1966, and others had seen a preliminary publication in 1991. James C. VanderKam and Jozef T. Milik, “The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 243-270.

has preserved the text in accurate form.”<sup>18</sup> Certainly where applicable DJD 13 should be consulted in addition to the apparatus and notes in VanderKam’s 1989 critical edition.

Detailed analysis of the variations between the Hebrew and Ethiopic manuscripts lies outside the scope of this study, but the larger fragments published in DJD 13 may suggest an intriguing possibility. The oldest manuscript of Jubilees, 4Q216, dates from the second century BCE, and reflects the most variations with the Ethiopic tradition (though mostly minor in significance).<sup>19</sup> Another fragment large enough to warrant significant comparison (4Q219) dates from the Herodian period, and presents “virtually no disagreements” with the Ethiopic tradition.<sup>20</sup> Even from this limited evidence we have cause to ask not of the extent to which the Ethiopic texts agree with “the Hebrew,” but of the degree of variation within the early Hebrew transmission of the text. It seems likely that, apart from minor scribal error, the Book of Jubilees enjoyed more precise textual fixity in the subsequent centuries of transmission than it did in the first. If one focuses on the text critical details of Jubilees, it begins to appear that the Ethiopic tradition preserves *one* ancient Hebrew text very well, which may not be the oldest (or the poorest) of the ancient Hebrew texts. As interesting as the minor variations may be to the text criticism of Jubilees, even the relatively significant variations in phraseology between the Ethiopic

---

<sup>18</sup> This comment was made with regard to 4Q216. Similar comments were made with regard to the other texts substantial enough for comment on textual character. VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees (DJD 13),” 4.

<sup>19</sup> VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 640. See also, VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees (DJD 13),” 4. Perhaps the most intriguing possibilities are the cases where the Hebrew cannot be read but suggests room for more text than can be reconstructed from the Ethiopic. For example, there is room for about 1 ½ lines on angelic sabbath observance at fragment 7 lines 6-7 (pp. 21-22). Among the fully preserved variants, most are in prepositions or the additions or subtraction of a “כל” or “זאת.”

<sup>20</sup> VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 641, 646.

and the oldest of the Hebrew manuscripts generally do not impact the level of genre and worldview considered in this dissertation.

Since 1994 only minor textual advances have been made. In 1998 11QJubilees was republished by García Martínez and Tigchelaar. 11Q12 fragment 9 is particularly relevant because it reflects one of the more substantial variations from the Ethiopic versions. The Ethiopic of 12:29 contains a line of poetry in addition to what could possibly fit in fragment 9 (without postulating a marginal correction), here indicated in italics,

[ויאמר] לו תרח א[ביו]  
לך בשלום  
אל עולם יישיר דרככה  
ויהוה ע[מכה] ויש[מרכה מכול רע]

ወየሀብ : ላዕሌክ : ሣህለ : ወምሕረተ : ወጥገሰ : በቅድመ : አለ : ይፌእዶክ

[ולא ימשול בכה כול בני אדם לעשן] תכה רע

[לך בשלום]

His father Terah said to him:

Go in peace.

May the eternal God make your way straight;

May the Lord be with you and protect you from every evil;

*May he grant you kindness, mercy, and grace before those who see you;*

And may no person have power over you to harm you.

Go in peace. (Jubilees 12:29)

García Martínez and Tigchelaar comment, “Ethiopic has a line which is apparently missing in our text,” but do not elaborate.<sup>21</sup> In 1977 VanderKam considered the possibility of a loss in the Hebrew tradition or an addition in the Ethiopic tradition.<sup>22</sup> He

---

<sup>21</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, “11QJubilees,” in *Qumran Cave 11*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, DJD 23 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 209, 218.

<sup>22</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 49.

concluded that the older witness should be preferred, but he could not explain how or why an addition would have developed here. In my judgment, the poetic structure favors the originality of the “extra” line to fill out a second distich. Especially in the absence of a parallel elsewhere that could influence a longer blessing, a scribal omission seems more likely than a spontaneous (and apparently isolated) composition of a new line. Even if we give preference to the (much) older manuscript, however, no theological tendency could explain such an addition. Even if the variation were a strike against the reliability of the Ethiopic tradition, we could by no means extrapolate that variations of a certain sort are likely to be additions.

In 1999 Émile Puech suggested that 4Q484 is a copy of Jubilees, and raised the count of total manuscripts to seventeen or eighteen.<sup>23</sup> Even if the suggestion is correct, such a small fragment would be of little or no help for establishing the text history of Jubilees. It would be interesting if Jubilees moved up even further in the rankings of most attested works at Qumran, but one would have to apply Puech’s standards of identification evenly to make such a comparison. Our certainty will always remain limited by the accidents of preservation.

In 2001 Hanan Eshel attempted to identify a fragment with 11QJubilees. The identification is based on Eshel’s reading of twenty-four letters in three lines and the assertion that, “The writing in this fragment resembles that of 11QJubilees.”<sup>24</sup> There is nothing about the language of the fragment that particularly suggests Jubilees. His reconstruction requires a column width greater than the other columns in 11QJubilees,

---

<sup>23</sup> Émile Puech, “Une nouvelle copie du Livre des Jubilés: 4Q484 = pap4Jubilés<sup>j</sup>,” *RdQ* 19, no. 74 (1999): 261-264.

<sup>24</sup> Hanan Eshel, “Three New Fragments from Qumran Cave 11,” *DSD* 8, no. 1 (2001): 4.



and a shorter text than would be reconstructed based on the Ethiopic. Eshel's claim does not affect the count of how many copies of Jubilees were found at Qumran. Even if the identification is accepted, the reconstruction is highly speculative, and constitutes thin evidence for a shorter original version of Jubilees, or a dependent shorter version. As above, there is a certain danger of circularity in rejecting an identification of a fragment with Jubilees if it does not agree with the Ethiopic, but still a security in that the largest and most certain fragments confirm the Ethiopic, and only the smallest and most reconstructed fragments would require significant variation.

A papyrus in Coptic containing passages from Jubilees was published in 2003. The variants in this text are not likely to represent a better text than the Ethiopic or challenge the reliability of the Ethiopic manuscripts in general. They will, however, be relevant to detailed study of Jubilees 4:33; 7:14-16; 8:28-30; 9:27 and 15:3.

I am aware of no other textual evidence that has become available since VanderKam's 1989 critical edition.<sup>25</sup> There is more evidence that reflects the influence of the Book of Jubilees, but does not help us confirm any particular textual readings. We can conclude that VanderKam's critical edition, along with DJD 13, provide a reasonably reliable text of the Book of Jubilees. Although two translations and centuries of copying limit our confidence in the accuracy of the Ethiopic text, the known inaccuracies are best identified as scribal error, not a pattern of theological or other revision. Of course, just

---

<sup>25</sup> Two desiderata do remain, however. First, with more careful attention and modern imaging technology it may be possible to read more of the Latin palimpsest than was possible for Ceriani. Second, it may be the case that a copy of Jubilees made it to the Qaraite Synagogue in Cairo much like the Damascus Document. The Qaraite attribute beliefs about "Mastema" (a term fairly distinctive to Jubilees) to the Sadducees (to whom they also attributed the Damascus Document). Quotation or paraphrase of Jubilees may remain to be found in the texts from the Cairo Geniza. See Yoram Erder, "שר משטמה בחיבור קראי," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 243-246.

because the manuscript evidence does not suggest major textual corruption does not mean that the entire Ethiopic Jubilees comes from a single author with no additions or subtractions. We now turn to the question of the coherence of the composition of the Book of Jubilees.

### 3.2. Coherence of composition

The Book of Jubilees is a remarkably unified composition. Many scholars hold it to be completely unified,<sup>26</sup> while some find evidence of insertions or redaction of previous compositions. Almost all agree that one can speak of a unified composition or redaction of Jubilees, even if component sources or minor insertions are claimed as qualifications. The minimum argument of this section pertains to the coherence of chapter 23 internally and within the book. Although the chapter strains expectations and is indeed unique, it does not follow that the chapter or the book comes from multiple authors. In addition to the minimum argument, we can gain broader insight into the composition of Jubilees by considering additional challenges to the unity of the composition. Most of the attempts to qualify the unity of Jubilees pose no challenge to the argument of this dissertation. If one views the Book of Jubilees as the product of a series of compositions, redactions and insertions, then my core argument applies to a stage when chapter 23 existed in a revelatory framework such as the one provided by chapter 1. One might take my arguments about the author of Jubilees as applicable to the

---

<sup>26</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 17-18. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis* (London: A. and C. Black, 1902), xlv-xlvii.

redactor of Jubilees. My own view remains, however, that the Book of Jubilees is a remarkably coherent composition that could have come from a single author.

I do not hesitate to speak of the author of Jubilees as an individual person. I do not think that the author wrote the book in a single sitting, for a single purpose, to express a single idea. Clearly the author knew and was influenced by a significant number of written and oral sources, but I do not find evidence that the author copied extended passages directly from written sources other than Genesis and Exodus. The book may indeed be the product of a lifetime of study and composition by a person who may have been dedicated to the study and teaching of Jewish traditions. The author may have been unconcerned with certain details, such as arithmetic, and tolerant of certain redundancies and inconsistencies. I find many of the “contradictions” that have been claimed to be valid but mislabeled observations. One can legitimately point to seams in the compositional process. Nevertheless, seams can exist in the work of a single person.

### 3.2.1. Four general comments on theories of multiplicity of authorship

Before considering individual challenges to the unity of Jubilees, four basic comments apply to the general discussion. The first is the simple fact that none of the individual challenges has gained scholarly consensus thus far. At most, certain patterns emerge. Leora Ravid’s claim that the sabbath laws in Jubilees 50:6-13 were inserted gained support, with modification, from Kister and Segal, but has been rejected by Doering and VanderKam.<sup>27</sup> For the reasons developed in this dissertation, Jubilees 23 has

---

<sup>27</sup>Leora Ravid, “הלכות השבת בספר היובלים נ 6-13,” *Tarbiz* 69, no. 2 (2000): 161-166. VanderKam’s article on the unity of the Book of Jubilees deals with the particulars of 50:6-13 but covers many of the

attracted attention and, by failing to conform to scholarly expectations, has been seen as incompatible with the rest of the book. Even here it is striking that no two scholars offer the same claim for what parts of Jubilees 23 should be excised.<sup>28</sup> Although this point does not apply to very recent proposals, such as Segal's 2004 dissertation published in 2007, the weight of scholarly consensus will justify spending less time on the theories that were presented more than thirty years ago.

Second, there is no manuscript evidence for any of the theories of redaction or insertion. The evidence from Qumran has already disproved a number of points and theories,<sup>29</sup> and has supported none of them. There is no evidence that any passage circulated separately, in a different order, or was missing. Although it is not impossible

---

broader issues of unity raised by Testuz, Wiesenberg, Davenport and Ravid. James C. VanderKam, "The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6-13 and the Unity of the Book," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, JSJSup 119 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 267-284. Lutz Doering, "Jub 50:6-13 als Schlussabschnitt des Jubiläenbuchs—Nachtrag aus Qumran oder ursprünglicher Bestandteil des Werks?," *RdQ* 20, no. 79 (2002): 359-387. Menahem Kister, "על שני מטבעות לשון בספר היובלים," *Tarbiz* 70, no. 2 (2001): 297 n.47. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 19-20.

<sup>28</sup> Michel Testuz identifies 23:11-32 as an interpolation; Werman views 23:9-15, 17-18, 25-30a, 31-32 as an older source interpolated by the author of the rest of the book; Davenport identifies 23:14-20, 22-31 as the product of the first redactor. Kister wonders if an interpolation might start with verse 12, presumably through the end of the chapter. Berner views 23:14-31 as an addition. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 40. Cana Werman, "ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן: לשאלת היחס בין השניים," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 43. Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, Studia Post-Biblica 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 46. Menahem Kister, "לתולדות כת האיסיים: עיונים בחזון החיות, ספר היובלים וברית דמשק," *Tarbiz* 56, no. 1 (1986): 6 n.21. Christoph Berner, "50 Jubilees and Beyond? Some Observations on the Chronological Structure of the Book of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

<sup>29</sup> Two examples: First, 4Q216 and 4Q221 have preserved intact two of the passages that Testuz took to be additions (1:7-25,28; 23:11-32). If they were added, they must have been added earlier than Testuz imagined. 4Q221 also preserves parts of six other chapters, confirming that the chapter existed in the larger context of the Book. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 39-42. Second, Davenport found a contradiction between a source which imagined the angel *writing* Jubilees and a source which imagined the angel *dictating* Jubilees. 4Q216 later confirmed what VanderKam had already suggested in 1981, that the confusion results from the resemblance of the *qal* and *hiphil* forms of the root *ktb*. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 15. James C. VanderKam, "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26 (1981): 209-217.

that some small fragment that has been identified as a copy of Jubilees is in fact a copy of an independent composition later incorporated into Jubilees, there is no positive evidence for such a possibility.<sup>30</sup> As discussed above, 11Q12 fragment 9 may suggest an added or deleted line of poetry, but this was never suspected previously nor would have been suspected given any of the criteria for identifying interpolations. All of the remaining theories postulate redaction or interpolation prior to the earliest manuscript evidence. On one hand, the evidence is fragmentary and a number of passages could well have escaped the fortune of preservation. On the other hand, relatively speaking, Jubilees is a well attested document at Qumran. Even if the manuscript evidence does not disprove every theory, it does form a pattern in that it has disproved some challenges to the unity of Jubilees and proved none. The theories of redaction and insertion depend not on physical evidence, but on subjective claims that conceptual contents are contradictory or inconsistent.<sup>31</sup>

A third general comment refers to the theories of interpolation by a Qumran scribe from Testuz,<sup>32</sup> Davenport,<sup>33</sup> and Ravid.<sup>34</sup> Each of these tacitly assumes that the text preserved in Ethiopic derives from a text copied by a Qumran sectarian.<sup>35</sup> Although

---

<sup>30</sup> Naturally, we are not considering here manuscripts of sources that were known to the author of Jubilees but not incorporated directly.

<sup>31</sup> The conceptual differences are often of such a minor nature that one can easily imagine a single author maintaining two strands of thought, or else they point not to problems with the unity of authorship but to problems with modern categories and perceived exclusivity of ideas.

<sup>32</sup> Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 42.

<sup>33</sup> Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 16. See also, VanderKam, "The End of the Matter?," 272.

<sup>34</sup> Ravid, "הלכות השבת בספר היובלים נ 6-13," 161-166.

<sup>35</sup> Cana Werman claims that the book as a whole was written by a Qumran scribe, but there is nothing tacit about her argument. Werman, "ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן," 37-55.

this is possible, it is not a safe assumption. There are no parallels for sectarian documents from Qumran being exported, translated and copied, and we have no reason to believe that Qumranic recensions of non-sectarian documents ever displaced textual traditions outside the sect.<sup>36</sup> A copy of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice was found at Masada, but this hardly establishes extra-sectarian circulation. The copy of the Damascus Document in the Cairo Geniza is best explained by the fact that 1947 began the most recent but not the first series of discoveries in the Judean Desert.<sup>37</sup> The possibility that an interpolation by a Qumran sectarian *per se* made it into the Ethiopic is rather unlikely. If anything, one might speculate more generally that a person with an editorial interest comparable to what we know from the Qumran sectarian documents made an interpolation. None of the pluses found in the Qumran manuscripts but not the Ethiopic suggest a sectarian interpolation.

Finally, even if the observations that I identify as seams in the compositional process are taken as evidence of plurality in composition, redaction, and insertion, it remains the case that Jubilees is a *relatively* coherent document among its contemporaries in ancient Jewish literature. Ultimately, an argument that the alleged inconsistencies could have been maintained by a single author does not require that there could only have been a single author, as opposed to a closely aligned school or tradition. Even if one chooses to accept all the possibilities that may be suggested by source and redaction criticism, one must keep in mind that the types of evidence and the degrees of inconsistency are nothing like what we have in the cases of the Pentateuch, the books of 1

---

<sup>36</sup> Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 156ff.

<sup>37</sup> James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 1-3.

Enoch, Sirach, Daniel and so forth. At most, Jubilees *could* be a composite text with a somewhat complex history of composition, redaction and insertion. Unlike many contemporary and older ancient texts, Jubilees at least *could* have been composed by a single author.

### 3.2.2. Some specific arguments

The specific arguments against the unity of the authorship of Jubilees range from abstract evaluations of literary style, tone and theological priorities, to specific points of conflict in the chronological and legal implications. They also range from claims that have been firmly refuted, to claims that come down to emphasis, semantics, or deeper questions of how we should conceive of authorship within a tradition in antiquity. Some argue for interpolations into a coherent composition, while some argue for layers and sources behind a coherent redaction. We will not consider every case that has ever been made against the unity of Jubilees, but we will sample some of each type. First, we will consider some older evaluations of literary style and tone from Davenport and Testuz, and more recently Kister. We will also consider a recent claim by Werman to distinguish two theological interests in Jubilees 23. We will then consider some of the claims of contradictions in details, first by surveying a number of contradictions that have already been resolved, then looking more closely at a chronological problem noted by Dimant. Finally, we will come to the seams between the primarily narrative and the primarily legal traditions of which Jubilees is built, as studied by Kister and Segal.

In what is by far the most ambitious application of form and redaction criticism to the Book of Jubilees, Gene Davenport listed a number of criteria for detecting strata of

composition and redaction.<sup>38</sup> Of these, perhaps the one most appropriate to Jubilees is the identification of seams between prose and poetry, although they are better taken as seams in composition than redaction. In most cases where we might have reasons to believe that the author borrowed interpretive traditions, we have every reason to believe that the author retold the tradition in a new way. Poetry, on the other hand, has a greater tendency to hold its literary shape. The fact that alleged conceptual contradictions do not align with breaks between poetry and prose perhaps itself speaks in favor of unity of authorship. Michel Testuz offers an exception, however, in the prose and poetry curses in Jubilees 24. Although I ultimately find the two curses or parts of the curse to be well within the range of compatibility necessary for a single author, I do find this to be one of the more likely cases of a seam, perhaps composed on different days and in different moods. Here Isaac curses the Philistine(s), first in prose using the plural “Philistines” and then in poetry using the collective singular, “he.” The prose section is more specific, and could perhaps be understood as an explanation of the poetry section. For example, while the poetry seems to suggest failed alliances with and captivity by the nations, the prose explains more specifically, “the Kittim.” Although I do not find it likely that the prose is an addition (with Testuz), or necessary to imagine that the poetry was copied from an earlier author, I do find it legitimate to distinguish a poetic curse and a prose explanation as components of what became a single continuous utterance in the mouth of Isaac.

Testuz also speaks of a difference in tone, which, unlike the poetic seams, continues to appear in current theories of multiplicity of authorship. Jubilees 24 may not be the best example, but Testuz is generally right that one occasionally finds in Jubilees

---

<sup>38</sup> Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 80.



specific and vitriolic rants about certain nations, such as might be consistent with a reaction to a recent event, and at other times a general and dry contempt for the nations. Like Testuz, Menahem Kister observed three degrees of harshness in Jubilees 23. Although he speculated that this may indicate different sources edited together, he appropriately admitted the speculative nature of such a suggestion.<sup>39</sup> It seems to me that the simplest explanation comes from considering the nature of the task. The author was writing something like a history based on older sources, but also had a perspective on history based on contemporary circumstances. While the author could maintain a calm “academic” contempt toward some nations or nations in general, in some cases the matter became more personal and the same author “lost his cool,” as it were. It is certainly not rare among historical apocalypses to gloss over vast expanses of history and then spend more and harsher words on the present circumstances.<sup>40</sup> We need not conclude from this tendency a plurality of authors, such as a “calm contempt source,” and an “angry source.”

Canan Werman notices similar seams, building on Kister but more confidently reconstructing sources.<sup>41</sup> She notices two different types of guilt (and punishment) in

---

<sup>39</sup> “It seems that these rough edges likely indicate that we perhaps have a joining of different sources, and among them an apocalypse (beginning with verse 12, ‘in those days’?). However, there is no way to be certain of the matter.” Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 6 n.21. My translation.

<sup>40</sup> The contrast between general historical groups and specific recent groups within a review of history is noted by Werman. She attributes the disparity to different sources. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 43.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.: 37-55. In addition to the different structures of sins, sinners, and punishments discussed in this paragraph, she also argues from structural aesthetics. She claims that if Jub 23:16, 19-24, 30b is excised then one is left with a four period progression (antediluvian, flood to Moses, Moses to present, and future) with a chiasmic structure in the last two periods (diminished lifespans-suffering-guilt-summary-guilt-suffering-diminished lifespans). I find it arbitrary to assign Jubilees 23:15 to the present and Jubilees 23:17 to the future, and read the same verses (if one accepts her categories and interpolations) as anything but chiasmic (lifespan-suffering-lifespan-suffering-sin-lifespan-suffering mixed with sin-[interpolation]-sin-suffering mixed with sin-[interpolation]-lifespan-suffering). She also suggests a contradiction between an older source that copied from Hesiod and a later author that opposed Hellenism. The connection to Hesiod is thin and there is no reason to believe the author of Jubilees would have considered the ancient traditions

Jubilees 23: a general guilt that applies to the nations, and a covenantal guilt that applies to Israel.<sup>42</sup> She observes an important issue in Jubilees that pertains to the different standards of testimony, sin, and judgment that apply to the gentiles and to Israel. The observation is not best explained, however, by postulating that one author thought the gentiles were sinful and another author thought Israel had been sinful.<sup>43</sup> The same author certainly could have thought both and incorporated both into a single chapter.

In addition to the more abstract “contradictions” related to multiplicity of tone, concerns and interests, a number of contradictions in the details and implied details of the composition have been claimed. We will start with some more isolated and mundane claims, and move towards the most systematic claim (by Segal in particular) that the author of the halakhic material incorporated but did not write the narrative material. Some of the more mundane claims have already been disproved. For example, Gene Davenport claimed a contradiction on whether the angel dictated or wrote the Book of Jubilees. This claim was refuted with argumentation in 1981,<sup>44</sup> and later by manuscript evidence from 4Q216. Michel Testuz claimed a contradiction between use of the names

---

of descending quality of life and metals to be an exclusively Hellenistic tradition. As in the Book of Daniel, the similarities stop well short of suggesting dependence. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 93.

<sup>42</sup> Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 43.

<sup>43</sup> The treatment of the problem that Israel seems to suffer as much as (and even more than) other nations despite their special relationship with God seems to have been triggered by the pattern in Genesis that lifespans continue to diminish universally, even in the case of one as righteous and chosen as Abraham. The solution in Jubilees seems to be that earth and humanity as a whole are diminished by defilement. Israel has the ability to separate from and cleanse itself of that defilement because of their special covenantal relationship with God. To the extent that Israel mingles with the nations, however, they are punished both with the nations for their defilement (diminished lifespans), and in addition to the nations for their covenantal infidelity (invasion and captivity).

<sup>44</sup> VanderKam, “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” 209-217.

Mastema (frequent in Jubilees) and Belial (Jubilees 1:20 and 15:33).<sup>45</sup> Although the simplest explanation is to simply imagine a thesaurus-like substitution of synonyms by a single author, it is not clear to me that Belial is here a name synonymous with Mastema, rather than a form of the impersonal noun בליעל found often in the Tanakh. In both places in Jubilees it appears in construct, once describing a spirit and once a people.<sup>46</sup> Ernest Wiesenberg calculated two chronological structures in Jubilees,<sup>47</sup> and has been corrected by VanderKam.<sup>48</sup> Ravid's perception of a hermeneutical contradiction is doubted even by those who accept the basic claim of insertion.<sup>49</sup>

We might take a closer look at one of the chronological issues that Devorah Dimant identified as evidence of sloppy redaction.<sup>50</sup> Jubilees 4:21 reads,

ወሀሎ : እንከ : ምስለ : መላእክተ : አምላክ : ስድስተ : ዘኢየሴልወሳት :  
ዓመታተ ::

[JCVK] He was, moreover, with God's angels for six jubilees of years.  
(Jubilees 4:21)

Genesis 5:22 reads,

וַיְהִי לֶךְ חַנּוּךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־מֶתוֹשֶׁלַח שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיֹּלֶד בָּנִים  
(Genesis 5:22) : וּבָנָיו

---

<sup>45</sup> Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 41. For the present purposes the variant forms *Beliar* and *Belial* are not distinguished.

<sup>46</sup> See further page 289 below.

<sup>47</sup> Ernest Wiesenberg, "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RdQ* 9, no. 3 (1961-1962): 3-40.

<sup>48</sup> James C. VanderKam, "Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees," in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup 62 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 522-544.

<sup>49</sup> See note 27 above.

<sup>50</sup> Devorah Dimant, "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch," *Vetus Testamentum* 33, no. 1 (1983): 21 n.17.

In the Book of Jubilees a jubilee consists of 49 years.<sup>51</sup> In Dimant's view, Jubilees 4:21 intended to refer to 300 years, and was written by an author who counted a jubilee as fifty years. She concludes, "This shows that Jubilees borrows from various sources, often without reconciling the contradictions."<sup>52</sup> In some cases like this, one might think that the contradiction is no more than a compression of detail, reducing "six jubilees and six years" to "(circa) six jubilees"<sup>53</sup> or "six jubilees (plus change)."<sup>54</sup> It might also be possible to understand 294 years as an interpretation or "making more precise" (מדויקדק) of the 300 years as a reference to a 294 year calendrical cycle. A more likely explanation presents itself. Jubilees understands the time Enoch spent "touring with angels," as taking place between the time Enoch fathered Methuselah and the time Enoch fathered other children. Jubilees reads the 300 years as the time of Enoch's "life" between begetting Methuselah and his translocation. Of these, 294 were spent touring with angels, followed by six more of fathering children and testifying.<sup>55</sup> Thus, the chronology of Enoch's life would be: age 65, beget Methuselah and start to tour with angels; age 359, return from tour and start fathering more children (and testifying); age 365, translocation to Eden.

---

<sup>51</sup> Jubilees does, however, use the concept of the jubilee as a fiftieth unit. The chronology of the Book presents the jubilee of jubilees (fiftieth jubilee) as a jubilee of release and return. See appendix 6.6.6 for the possibility that Jubilees anticipates a jubilee of years (fiftieth year) release and return in the "eschatological" period of purity.

<sup>52</sup> On a minor note, an implication of Dimant's argument is that the source text here also calculated time in terms of jubilees, but by a different definition of jubilee.

<sup>53</sup> James C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13, no. 1 (1978): 235 (316 in reprint).

<sup>54</sup> 4Q227 fragment 2 preserves [...] ששה יובלי שנים [...], making a textual omission less likely, although it should be pointed out that this is a manuscript of "Pseudo-Jubilees," not Jubilees.

<sup>55</sup> A similar explanation has been presented by VanderKam. James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London; New York: Routledge, 1998), 121, n. 18. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 33.

Jubilees accounts for the remaining six years; there is no contradiction. Jubilees resolves the question that results from interpreting “walked with God” as “toured with angels,” namely, where did Enoch father a plurality of sons and daughters if he was touring with angels all of the last three hundred years of his life?

We have seen that a good number of the “contradictions” in Jubilees are very minor or not contradictions at all. I do not wish to argue, however, that Jubilees contains *no* inconsistencies. Indeed, recent scholarship has produced insight into the compositional seams in one of the most fundamental tasks of Jubilees: the interweaving of legal material in the narrative material of Genesis-Exodus and dependent traditions. By all accounts, Jubilees inherits and depends upon a wealth of narrative and legal traditions. Although individual examples and arguments may be debatable, it at least seems agreeable that redundancies, inconsistencies, and even contradictions can be found in the implications of certain details in Jubilees. The question, however, is whether these kinds of inconsistencies necessarily imply a multiplicity of authors.

In my view, many minds produced the traditions in Jubilees, but one author composed the text which brings them together with remarkable, but not perfect, acumen. The author of Jubilees was constrained by the narrative and legal material received, and by the theological claim of their compatibility. The author could not “make up” legal rulings or received traditions about the ancestors. The author seems to have proceeded with the theological claim that the oral and written legal and narrative traditions of Judaism, properly understood, are not only consistent but mutually illuminating.<sup>56</sup> From a

---

<sup>56</sup> James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 17.

historical-critical perspective, this claim is problematic. Especially when one is speaking of contradictions in the implications rather than overt statements, one should not ask what contradictions are in Jubilees, but what contradictions in the received tradition did the author fail to resolve. Moreover, one should keep in mind that the original audience was rational by its own standard, not the modern historical-critical standard. The original audiences were likely sympathetic to the pursuit of harmony and consistency in the received traditions, and disputed only the qualifier, “properly understood.” Thus, we should view the reconciliation of traditions in Jubilees not with contempt for the seams, but appreciation of the overall genius.

Menahem Kister distinguishes the traditions in Jubilees that originally existed for *aggadic* purposes, from those that originally existed for *halakhic* purposes. Kister follows Albeck and Baumgarten in studying the contradiction between the halakhic implications of Jubilees 7:1-7 and 7:35-37. Assuming the text is sound (see the notes in VanderKam 1989), the first passage suggests that Noah made wine from the fruits of the fourth year produce, and drank the wine on the first day of the fifth year. The second passage prescribes sanctification of fourth year produce as first fruits, released in the fifth year. Albeck resolves the problem with the distinction that Noah, but not all his sons, represented priests.<sup>57</sup> Baumgarten distinguishes the redemption of the fourth year produce in the fifth year from the redemption of the fifth year produce.<sup>58</sup> Kister finds their arguments forced. We do not need to adjudicate the details. Even as a disputed

---

<sup>57</sup> Chanoch Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 47 (Berlin: Berlin-Schöneberg, 1930), 32-33.

<sup>58</sup> J. M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of Orlah and First Fruits in Light of Jubilees, The Qumran Writings, and the Targum Ps-Jonathan,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (1987): 198 n.10.

example, Kister's conclusion is likely correct as far as it goes, "Different traditions were included in the Book of Jubilees, and it stands to reason that not all of them were sectarian."<sup>59</sup> The crux of the matter becomes apparent in another formulation by Kister, "The story was not created to serve the halakhic purposes of the Book of Jubilees, but rather existed independently."<sup>60</sup> Several questions arise. Does multiplicity of purpose imply multiplicity of authorship? Assuming such a story did exist independently in some form, where do we draw the line between authorship and redaction?

### 3.2.3. Segal's theory of the redaction of Jubilees

Michael Segal extends Kister's program with a systematic study of the composition of Jubilees.<sup>61</sup> Segal argues for replacing the idea of an author of Jubilees with a redactor. The redactor is responsible for the legal passages, chronological framework, and narrative framework (chapters 1-2, 23, and part of 50), but not the rest of the narrative contents. These narratives came from a variety of written and oral traditions.<sup>62</sup> The major implication is that we cannot speak of one worldview for the

---

<sup>59</sup> Menahem Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumran Halakhah," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 12 (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1992), 585.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 587.

<sup>61</sup> Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*. This is the published version of his dissertation, written under Menahem Kister, Michael Segal, "ספר היובלים: שכתוב המקרא, עריכה, אמונות ודעות" (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2004). Parts of the argument appeared elsewhere, including Michael Segal, "The Relationship Between the Legal and Narrative Passages in 'Jubilees'," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 203-228. Michael Segal, "עיון מחודש בסיפור הכניסה לגן עדן," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 111-125.

<sup>62</sup> "The final product, as known to us today, is not the work of one individual, but a compound of different traditions and sources. The redactor's contribution can be found in the chronological framework

entire book of Jubilees, but only for the redactional layer.<sup>63</sup> The present work is basically compatible with Segal's argument. The difference between calling the person responsible for the book as we know it "the author" or "the redactor" is partly semantic, but partly points to different conceptions of authorship in Jubilees and in antiquity generally. Even where compositional seams can be detected, I do not find unresolved contradictions at the level of worldview, and do not limit discussion of the worldview to certain passages. However, I do concede as a point in favor of Segal's basic observation that the clearest passages indicating the distinctive worldview of Jubilees have been identified by Segal as the redactional layer.<sup>64</sup> It probably is the case that Segal has successfully identified passages in which the (final) author more clearly and explicitly presents personal views and agendas. I would simply emphasize a point that Segal seems sometimes to concede and sometimes to neglect. Namely, the (final) author's use of received tradition is not passive copying, but active reworking that changes the theological meaning to fit a new framework. I would call that process authorship and that product a coherent composition. The author's worldview can be found in the reworking of traditions, even if a tension is inherent in reworking traditions already in tension. I would add that the legal material too draws from received traditional authorities.

---

throughout the book, in the legal passages juxtaposed to the rewritten stories, and in those passages that share the same unique terminology with the legal passages." Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 35.

<sup>63</sup> "The recognition of the complexity of this material allows for an accurate investigation of the redactor's perspective, in contrast to those expressed in his sources." Ibid., 264, similarly 14, 318.

<sup>64</sup> Segal's list on page 24 is not a complete list of passages he includes in the redactional layer. To these must be added chapters 1, the rest of 2, 5:13-18, 19:26-29, most of 23, and 50:1-5, 13b. Ibid., 30 n.80, 141, 238 n. 24, 247 n. 1, 258 n. 2, 318.



Before elaborating on the disagreements, several fundamental agreements should be emphasized. First, Segal and I seem to agree that there was no version of Jubilees prior to the halakhic and chronological layer, only miscellaneous independent sources.<sup>65</sup> Second, we seem to agree that the work as we have it is basically the same coherent product of that second century author/redactor, with few or no complete passages added in the following centuries.<sup>66</sup> Third, we agree in rejecting the opposite extreme, which Segal identifies as the state of scholarship.<sup>67</sup> Certainly Jubilees uses traditions other than the Pentateuch, and we cannot imagine that everything found in Jubilees but not a version of the Pentateuch is the invention of a single mind.<sup>68</sup> Fourth, we agree that the use of extant sources and traditions involves active (I would say creative) adaptation: “altering its emphases... new theological construct” (169, 268), “did not merely copy... incorporated... within a new framework” (177), “Thus the earlier traditions were preserved, but were infused with a new meaning regarding the question of the origin of evil in the world” (180), “message of the story was changed” (264), “the redactor did not limit himself to copying and joining existing sources, but also integrated them within the framework of a new literary composition” (317), “the redactor did not quote his sources word for word as he found them, but rather inserted certain changes into them” (318).

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 320.

<sup>66</sup> The only exception being 50:6-13a, which is essential to neither of our arguments. Ibid., 19-20.

<sup>67</sup> Many scholars recognize, however, that one of the main innovations of Jubilees is to take narrative material from Genesis and related traditions, and impose a halakhic and chronological structure. Segal is not overturning the state of scholarship as much as he claims, but contributing to it by testing, confirming, and demonstrating the general observation with specific textual analysis.

<sup>68</sup> “Scholars generally compare the rewritten stories directly with the Pentateuch. Every difference, except for those that can be attributed to a textual witness of the Torah that Jubilees may have relied upon (...), is considered the work of ‘the author of Jubilees.’ All of the many, various phenomena have been attributed to this one putative author.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 10-11, likewise 21, 35, 264.

Specifically, we agree that we can see the author/redactor's *modus operandi* in the use of the Book of the Watchers.<sup>69</sup> The dependence on a written source is clear, but so is the transformation. The transformation is not just a reformulation and an addition, but a theological change in the view of evil. Finally, we can agree that the author/redactor did not resolve all the tensions implicit in attempting to reconcile a diversity of traditions and theological presuppositions into a single heavenly source.<sup>70</sup>

The disagreement begins with what to call such a process. Literary production fills a spectrum from anthologizing without interference (although even selection and ordering can be creative), to the hypothetical modern ideal of purely original creation. On such a spectrum, a distinction between redaction and authorship is valuable, but redaction implies arranging, reducing, and bringing together with small amounts of new material as “glue.” Authorship in antiquity should not be understood to exclude dependence on sources. If the “redactor” of Jubilees did not write the narrative passages, we have to ask who wrote the reworked rewritten material?<sup>71</sup> Of course we need to be aware that Jubilees used many sources, not all of which are otherwise known to us. Since we know Jubilees was creative in adapting those stories, we cannot exclude the rewriting from our study of the authorship, or the rewritten from our study of the composition.

Just as we should appreciate Jubilees according to ancient, not modern, conceptions of authorship, so too should we avoid imposing modern standards of

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>70</sup> “However, despite the attempts to create a new, unified composition, the interpretive difficulties discussed above demonstrate that the author was not completely successful in his task.” Ibid., 137 n. 86.

<sup>71</sup> “At times, the rewritten story in Jubilees is itself based upon another, already extant rewritten story, which was part of a different composition.” Ibid., 137.

consistency. Jubilees attempts to weave together a wide variety of traditions (both narrative and legal), and reconcile them with a complicated set of theological presuppositions. Whatever tensions (especially in minor implications) remain after such an undertaking attest to the difficulty of the task, not the sloppiness of the effort. It is dangerous for us to judge how much or what kind of tension can exist within the worldview of a single person, especially a person engaged in reconciling Jewish traditions.<sup>72</sup> It is a mischaracterization of Jubilees to describe it with contemptuous language such as “incoherent,” “illogical,” and “incomprehensible.”<sup>73</sup> It undervalues the acumen involved in weaving together various traditions to claim the author/redactor “did not attempt to resolve the difficulties.”<sup>74</sup> Segal’s best arguments stem from patterns in language and concern, but the contradictions are not nearly as contradictory as Segal suggests. We should briefly consider some of the best examples of contradictions.

The one clear example of a contradiction that even a non-hostile reader could notice without examining implications appears in Jubilees 28:17. There we read that Leah gave birth to four sons, while at that point in the story she should have given birth to only two. The contradiction is a matter of three words, and it is easy to imagine that a transmitter who “knew” Leah had four sons “corrected” a text that said she had two. The chronology of the sons of Jacob is complicated, so it is not the extreme of sloppiness to make such a mistake. It is possible, but not necessary, that such confusion was motivated by a concern for propriety, if Jacob’s intimate relationships overlapped.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Cf., “One person presumably possesses a unified worldview.” *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 30, 317.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 318.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 85-91.

Moreover, if the contradiction is only three words, then we already have reason to suspect Segal's claim that, "The contradictory elements in the book are always differentiated by their genres."<sup>76</sup> There is a legitimate observation behind the overstatement. While it is not helpful to argue that the legal passages are distinguished from the non-legal passages by the use of legal terminology, it is helpful to observe that Jubilees treats chronology as a legal matter.<sup>77</sup> Segal is correct to point to patterns in language and the most direct expressions of worldview, but the reader must scour Segal's footnotes or Jubilees itself to realize that the lines of language, genre and worldview are not so clear-cut. Segal does identify some narrative passages as belonging to the legal/chronological layer.<sup>78</sup> "Mastema" is an example of distinctive terminology that Segal asserts is absent from the legal/chronological layer,<sup>79</sup> but 19:28 and 49:2 should be admitted as exceptions. In other cases, the identification of a passage as legal, narrative, or chronological is not so clear. For example, Jubilees 41:23-26 is not clearly set apart from its surroundings by genre. Similarly, one of Segal's arguments works only if Jubilees 3:17 is *not* chronological, "When the conclusion of seven years which he had completed there arrived—seven years exactly—in the second month, on the seventeenth, the serpent came and approached the woman."<sup>80</sup>

That brings us to another example of a "contradiction," one which illustrates the subtlety of the tensions, and how they go back to issues that are already complicated in

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 317.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 227-228, 301.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 31 n. 80, 238 n. 24, 247 n. 1, 258 n. 2.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 126 n. 59.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 52.

the tradition.<sup>81</sup> According to Jubilees 3:17, Adam entered the Garden of Eden on the seventeenth of the second month, whereas some reasonable math would lead one to expect him to have entered four days earlier. The confusion goes back to whether Adam was created on the sixth day or the third day. If one thinks in terms of Genesis 1, Adam was created on the sixth day, but if one thinks in terms of a calendar that begins with the creation of the sun, then Adam was created on the third day. Both ideas exist in the tradition and any implicit confusion could have existed within a single person, and even more so in the history of transmission (especially if, as Segal argues, there was an exegetical motive to make both fit).<sup>82</sup> In fairness to Segal, not all of his “contradictions” are in such minor implications.<sup>83</sup> He argues that, even though the redactor thoroughly reworked the worldview of the Book of the Watchers, there remains a basic tension within Jubilees over whether evil existed from the beginning of creation or was introduced later.<sup>84</sup>

The other tensions are less explicit and more easily explained as “overkill.”<sup>85</sup> Segal is aware that the tensions have explanations, but invokes Occam’s razor to argue

---

<sup>81</sup> Segal calls this example the “most significant.” Ibid., 21.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 55-56.

<sup>83</sup> Segal is more persuasive in arguing positively that the redactional layer has a striking ideological consistency in beating the same drum, as it were. It should be enough to say that specific concerns of Jubilees are concentrated in certain passages (or a certain type of passage). The alleged contradictions with other passages are less persuasive and ultimately unnecessary. Ibid., 324.

<sup>84</sup> As expanded below in Chapters 5 and 7, Segal and I agree that Jubilees rejects the view of the Book of the Watchers, but we do not agree on the view that it promotes, or whether that view is consistently maintained in the book.

<sup>85</sup> Segal refers to James L. Kugel, *In Potiphar’s House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1990), 256-257. James L. Kugel, *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997), 28-34.

that it is simpler to explain all the contradictions with a comprehensive theory of composition than with individual nuances.<sup>86</sup> Even if Segal's solution has a simple elegance, the demonstrations of the contradictions are long and complicated. Jubilees takes on complicated problems, particularly in projecting law and justice onto the patriarchal narratives. The complicated solutions in Jubilees are only fitting the problems.

If we do not project modern standards of authorship and consistency on the ancient world, we can still call the person who produced Jubilees the "author" and the composition itself "coherent." I would emphasize the skill with which the author combines traditions into a literary and theological unity, leaving relatively few, relatively minor seams to allow the modern scholar to reconstruct the composition of the work. That said, Segal is largely convincing in many insights into the process of composition.

3.3. The Book of Jubilees was composed in the second century BCE, probably shortly after 159 BCE.

Whether one emphasizes redaction or composition, most scholars agree that the Book of Jubilees existed essentially as we now know it by the middle of the second century BCE. Giving a precise date is difficult by all accounts. It is made somewhat easier to the extent to which Jubilees is a unified composition, and somewhat harder to the extent to which Jubilees develops older traditions. Even the work of a single author could have come together over a number of years. The best arguments for date depend on

---

<sup>86</sup> Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 27.

persistent patterns in the work, and a few passages in which the veil of pseudonymity blows in the wind of historical circumstances.

The Book of Jubilees was written in the second century BCE. The certainty of this range depends more on the luck of preservation of external evidence than on any clear indications within the book. Early scholars advanced theories that dated Jubilees as early as the Persian period or as late as the Jewish response to Christianity.<sup>87</sup> Even today, the evidence for a precise date within the second century is not as strong as we might like. Scholars mostly favor a date towards the middle of the second century, based especially on parallels with 1-2 Maccabees.<sup>88</sup> A date in the first third of the century can still be

---

<sup>87</sup> Rowley, Charlesworth and VanderKam offer surveys of older scholarship on the date of Jubilees. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 84-90. James H. Charlesworth, "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 193. James C. VanderKam, "The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*, 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 4-16.

Dillmann (followed by Schürer) correctly observed that Jubilees presumes (parts of) 1 Enoch and an existing temple cult, but erred in accepting a first century CE date for those parts of 1 Enoch. Dillmann, "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis," 88-94. Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 3 vols., vol. 3 (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1898), 3.277.

Rönsch read the prohibition of spilling blood as opposition to the Christian rite concerning the Last Supper. H. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1874).

Zeitlin dated the book to the early second temple period, "when it could be hoped that opposition to the Pentateuch would not be wholly futile." Solomon Zeitlin, "The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance," *JQR* 30 (1939): 31. Solomon Zeitlin, "Criteria for the Dating of Jubilees," *JQR* 36, no. 2 (1945): 187-189.

Albright found enough Greek place names to require composition in the Hellenistic period, but still found evidence for great antiquity (early 3<sup>rd</sup> century, possibly late 4<sup>th</sup>) in allusions to Canaanite legend and an angelology closer to Job than Enoch and Daniel. William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940), 266-267 (346-347 in second edition).

<sup>88</sup> Most scholars in this category follow VanderKam's thorough treatment in 1977 which narrowed the date "almost certainly... between 161 and 140 BC and probably between 161 and 152 BC." In subsequent studies VanderKam has reinforced this judgment. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 284. VanderKam, "Origins and Purposes of Jubilees," 20.

defended, usually based on the argument that Jubilees is silent about the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes in 167 BCE.<sup>89</sup> A date in the last third of the century can also be

---

Earlier defenses of this approximate range include the following.

Bohn (followed by Littmann) placed Jubilees in a time when the Hasidim still went hand in hand with the new Maccabean dynasty. F. Bohn, "Die Bedeutung des Buches der Jubiläen: Zum 50jährigen Jubiläum der ersten, deutschen Übersetzung," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken; eine Zeitschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Theologie* 73 (1900): 167-184. E. Littmann, "Das Buch der Jubiläen," in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, ed. E. Kautzsch (Freiburg; Leipzig: Mohr [Siebeck], 1900), 31-38.

Jaubert notes the double meaning of "Judah," implying Judah Maccabee when dealing with Judah the patriarch in the war narratives. Annie Jaubert, *The Date of the Last Supper* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965), 125-128.

Not including scholars who simply follow VanderKam, additional arguments for this date have been made by the following.

Berger adopts the late end of VanderKam's suggestion, 145-140 BCE. Klaus Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Band 2 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981), 300.

Schwarz focuses on the imperative for national identity at the beginning of the Maccabean revolt. Eberhard Schwarz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung: Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen: zugleich ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Jubiläenbuches*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XXIII, Theologie 162 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1982), 102-126.

Endres also studies Jubilees as a response to the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes. John C. Endres, "Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees" (Dissertation, Vanderbilt, 1982), 238. Revised for publication as, John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, CBQMS 18 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987).

The revision of Schürer by Vermès, Millar and Goodman places the book shortly after the death of Judah Maccabee. Emil Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, revised ed., 3 vols., vol. 3, part 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885, 1986), III,1,313.

<sup>89</sup> Meyer and Albright dated the composition to the beginning of the century. Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart; Berlin: Cotta, 1924), 2.45ff.

Finkelstein, Wacholder, Nickelsburg, Goldstein and Knibb read the book as a reaction to events under Antiochus Epiphanes, but prior to the decrees of 167 BCE. Louis Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)," *HTR* 36, no. 1 (1943): 24. Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, no. 8 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983), 42. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 73-74 (78-79 in first edition). Jonathan A. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," in *Semites, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in Their Interactions* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 161-180. Michael A. Knibb, "Jubilees and the Origins of the Qumran Community," in *Inaugural Lecture in the Department of Biblical Studies, King's College, London, 17 January 1989* (1989), 16-17.



defended on arguments that Jubilees refers to events and issues from the reign of Hyrcanus I, or a general tendency to date texts as late as unambiguous evidence allows.<sup>90</sup> A number of scholars are content that a precise date within the century lies outside the scope of our knowledge.

Although this dissertation could work, perhaps with some modifications, for any date within the second century, the best of the evidence and the scholarly consensus do suggest a higher probability for a date in the years following 159 BCE. If one favors an earlier date, then my treatment of the Animal Apocalypse and Daniel as contemporary apocalypses may raise an eyebrow. Even still, I would suggest that apocalypses and the apocalyptic worldview existed earlier in a similar form, even if some of the best of the preserved evidence dates from slightly later (the Book of the Watchers dates earlier). If one favors a late date, then my omission of Qumran sectarian literature might be a

---

Finkelstein also notes the lack of sectarian strife and identifies the support of the institution of the high priesthood but criticism of the current high priests as matching well the high priesthods of Jason and Menelaus.

Kugel suggests a date even before 175 and defends his view that Aramaic Levi depends on Jubilees. James L. Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 155.

<sup>90</sup> Charles' arguments have not withstood the test of time, even among those who accept his dates from 135-105 BCE. For example, he claims that the title "priest of the Most High God" was particular to the Hasmonean period, but in fact Jubilees could have known it from Genesis 14:18. In his commentary he identifies verses in Jubilees 23 with events of the 160s. Charles, *Jubilees*, xiii.

Testuz followed Charles for the base text, and posited three insertions from 62-38 BCE. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 25-42.

Mendels aligns the concerns in Jubilees with the political events around 125 BCE. Doron Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 15 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987), 57-88.

Werman claims the book was written by a member of the Qumran sect at the end of the century. Werman, "ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן," 38-39.

problem. In such a larger project, I would still justify treating the sectarian and non-sectarian evidence separately.<sup>91</sup> The concepts of literary genre and worldview in the body of this dissertation are broader than any one text or sect. The date makes the biggest difference when we ask *why* the author of Jubilees might have used the genre “apocalypse” ironically. At an early date, one might wonder if the apocalyptic worldview was developed enough to be parodied, and at a later date there may be more comparative evidence for harmonization of ideas that had previously been held in opposition. The date of composition will make a difference on a number of smaller points, and it is therefore worthwhile to spend some pages reviewing the evidence and arguments already available, and hopefully adding something new.

In the next sub-section I will treat the implications of the paleography of the oldest manuscript of Jubilees and some texts which depend on Jubilees. I will then turn to the texts on which Jubilees depends. Then I will review the principal parallels in Jubilees with issues and events known from 1-2 Maccabees, including the Hellenization issues of the gymnasium and circumcision, the way the wars of the patriarchs are imagined, and finally the historical allusions in chapter 23.

---

<sup>91</sup> Even Cana Werman, who argues that Jubilees was written by a Qumran sectarian, admits that it differs in that it is written for an outside audience and thus assumes different authority and a different tone than the “internal” sectarian literature. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 37-55. Schubert made a similar point that the figure of Moses is used to address a broader public than the Teacher of Righteousness. Schubert, *Tradition und Erneuerung*, 264.

### 3.3.1. The oldest manuscript and texts which presume Jubilees

This sub-section will consider the external evidence for the latest possible date of Jubilees. It will proceed in two parts: the more certain evidence followed by the more speculative evidence. Among the more certain evidence I include the paleographical dating of the oldest preserved copy of Jubilees, and the citation of Jubilees in the Damascus Document. The implication of *how* the Damascus Document uses Jubilees will bring us to the second part. A number of more speculative points are worth noting and even reflect a scholarly consensus, but ought to be bracketed as less certain until more thorough studies can focus on the relationship between the composition of Jubilees and the sect that copied Jubilees and produced the Damascus Document. The most strictly minimal interpretation of the data requires a date for the composition of Jubilees before 100 BCE, but the evidence further suggests a date earlier than the consolidation of an exile community around the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness.

The older portion of 4Q216 (not counting the first leaf repaired at a later date) has been dated on paleographic grounds to circa 125-100 BCE by Milik and VanderKam. To the best of my knowledge, this much has not been seriously challenged. One does occasionally find selective phraseology, either as “circa 125” or “circa 100,” but this seems to be a subjective preference within the firmer but broader range. It seems safe to say that 4Q216 is not an autograph.

The Genesis Apocryphon, Aramaic Levi, and the Temple Scroll all seem to have some relationship with the Book of Jubilees, but are themselves difficult to date, and therefore do not help with the dating of Jubilees. Jubilees may depend on versions of

Aramaic Levi<sup>92</sup> and the Genesis Apocryphon,<sup>93</sup> but there is better evidence for excluding an early second century date. The Temple Scroll, on the other hand, more likely presupposes Jubilees, but does not establish the firmest or the earliest date by which Jubilees must have existed.<sup>94</sup>

The earliest clear reference to the Book of Jubilees *per se* (not its sources) is the Damascus Document. Perhaps the most legitimately questionable part is the date of the Damascus Document, or these portions thereof, but a date around the turn of the last century before our era seems to be agreeable. The Damascus Document clearly cites Jubilees in column sixteen, and refers to it rather directly in column 10. In column 16, lines 1-6 we read not only the ancient title of the work, but several of the concepts and phrases associated with it.<sup>95</sup>

עמכם ברית ועם כל ישראל על כן יקים האיש על נפשו לשוב אל  
תורת משה כי בה הכל מדוקדק *vacat* ופרוש קציהם לעורון  
ישראל מכל אלה הנה הוא מדוקדק על ספר מחלקות העתים  
ליובליהם ובשבועותיהם וביום אשר יקים האיש על נפשו לשוב  
אל תורת משה יסור מלאך המשטמה מאחריו אם יקים את דבריו  
... על כן נימול אברהם ביום דעתו *vacat*

... a covenant with you and with all Israel. Therefore, one will establish  
for oneself to return to the Mosaic law, for in it everything is made clear.

---

<sup>92</sup> Kugel, however, argues that Aramaic Levi assumes and summarizes an interpretation that Jubilees develops as an innovation. Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob*, 155. See also, Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 9 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>93</sup> Thus the original editors, Avigad and Yadin. Fitzmyer, however, argues that the Genesis Apocryphon expands Jubilees. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Biblica et Orientalia; 18B (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004), 26-28.

<sup>94</sup> Charlesworth weighs the possibilities and favors the priority of Jubilees. Charlesworth, "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll," 193-204. 4Q524 has been dated to 150-125 BCE, but it is no simple matter to identify this text with the Temple Scroll as we know it from later manuscripts found in cave 11.

<sup>95</sup> See also 4Q271 fragment 4 column 2.

As for the exact specification of the periods of Israel's blindness from all this, it is made clear in the Book of the Divisions of the Times According to Their Jubilees and Weeks. Thus on the day one establishes for oneself to return to the Mosaic law, the angel Mastema will stop going after him (if he keeps his word). Therefore Abraham circumcised himself on the day he knew about it. (Damascus Document 16.1-6)

“The Book of the Divisions of the Times According to Their Jubilees and Weeks,” or at least “The Book of the Divisions of the Times,” serves as the ancient title of the Book of Jubilees.<sup>96</sup> Devorah Dimant raises the possibility that some or all of this was not a title but a description of a book, but even as a description it uniquely fits the Book of Jubilees.<sup>97</sup> We know Jubilees was valued and highly available in the community (bracketing for now that the number of copies suggests authoritative which suggests likely to be cited). Dimant notes that other texts do speak of divisions of times in terms of Jubilees and weeks, but those texts do not begin to fit the description here.<sup>98</sup> The work referenced here is a book, which can probably be distinguished from a text such as 4Q319 *Otot*. It must predate the Damascus Document. It must specify the times when Israel turns a blind eye (which Jubilees 1 and 23 do). These criteria combined eliminate any other preserved text to which the Damascus Document could possibly refer. Further looser associations with the Book of Jubilees include the explicit requirement of returning to the Law of Moses (e.g. Jub. 23:26), the idea that turning to the Law of Moses grants

---

<sup>96</sup> See particularly the prologue, but also 1:4; 1:26; 1:29; and 50:13. 4Q216 attests to the antiquity of the phrase, and 4Q217 may be another early example of a work that refers to Jubilees by this name.

<sup>97</sup> Devorah Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint: Essays Presented to Eugene Ulrich on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Peter W. Flint, James C. VanderKam, and Emanuel Tov, VTSup 101 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 246ff. Devorah Dimant, “בני מנחה לשרה; מחקרים בפילוסופיה יהודית ובקבלה: שמים - תורת המלאכים בספר היובלים לאור כתבי עדת קומראן וילנסקי מוגשים לפרופסור שרה א' הלר וילנסקי,” ed. Moshe Idel, Devorah Dimant, and Shalom Rosenberg (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 99 n.9.

<sup>98</sup> Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions,” 247.

immunity from demons in general and Mastema by name, and the idea of circumcision as effecting immunity from Mastema.<sup>99</sup> There can be no doubt that the Damascus Document post-dates Jubilees in *that* it uses Jubilees; the more subtle point is that the Damascus Document must *significantly* post-date Jubilees based on *how* it uses Jubilees (see below, page 153).

The use of Jubilees in the Damascus Document also appears in column 10. Here, the Damascus Document does not cite the book by name, but authorizes a rule on a paraphrase of Jubilees 23:10-12. CD column 10 lines 7-10 read,

ואל יתיצב עוד מבן ששים שנה ומעלה לשפוט את העדה כי  
במעל האדם מעטו ימו  
ובחרון אף אל ביושבי הארץ  
אמר לסור את דעתם  
עד לא ישלימו את ימיהם

No one age sixty or older should serve as judge of the community, for  
by the sin of humanity one's days are diminished,  
and by the wrath of God at the inhabitants of the earth  
God decreed to divert their knowledge,  
before they complete their days. (Damascus Document 10.7-10)

This paraphrases Jubilees 23 with some interpretation, but no other text matches better than Jubilees 23:10-12,

... ቅድመ : ገጸ : እከይ : ወጸግበ : መዋዕላቲሁ : ወኩሉ : ትውልድ :  
ዘይትነሣእ : እምይእዜ : ወእስከ : ዕለተ : ደይን : ዐባይ : ይረስኡ : ፍጡነ :  
ዘእንበለ : ይፈጽሙ : ክልኤ : ኢዮቤልዉ :: ወትከውን : እንተ : ተነድጎሙ :  
እእምሮቶሙ : እምርስኦሙ : ወተከትት : ኩላ : እእምሮቶሙ : ወበውእቱ :  
መዋዕል : እመ : ሐይወ : ብእሲ : ኢዮቤልዉ : ወመንፈቀ : ዓመታት :  
ይብሉ : በእንቲከሁ : ከብዝነ : ሐይወ : ወመብዝነተ : መዋዕሊሁ : እማም :  
ወስራሕ : ወምንዳቤ : ወአልቦ : ሰላመ

---

<sup>99</sup> This last point can be gathered from the interpretation in Jubilees of Exodus 4:24-26, the pattern of Abram's indirect conflict with Mastema prior to his circumcision (particularly the connection via the ravens), and the discussion of circumcision laws in Jubilees 15:26-34, which identifies circumcision as the mark which guarantees forgiveness of sins and protection from angels of destruction.

[JCVK] ... in view of wickedness—and reached the end of his time (literally: completed his days). All the generations that will come into being from now until the great day of judgment will grow old quickly—before they complete two jubilees. It will be their knowledge that will leave them because of their old age; all of their knowledge will depart. At that time, if a man lives a jubilee and one-half of years, it will be said about him: ‘He has lived for a long time’. But the greater part of his time will be (characterized by) difficulties, toil, and distress without peace. (Jubilees 23:10-12)

The concepts and the language overlap significantly, beyond what could be explained as mutual derivation from Isaiah 65 and Psalm 90: the diminishment of knowledge in old age, the completion of days, and the idea of general human wickedness as the cause of diminished lifespan and knowledge.<sup>100</sup> The number “sixty” comes neither from Jubilees 23 nor the passages behind Jubilees, but seems to be logically derived from the facts that people die in their early 70s, and lose knowledge before they die (perhaps indirectly from Leviticus 27:7). The word “wrath” does not occur in these verses, but later in the chapter (23:22) we do read from 4Q176 fragment 20 “קצץ” ( → ὀργή → መቅደድ ). Although the concept of wrath is not absent from Jubilees 23, the emphasis and extension to this unit might fit with the suggestion below that the sectarian interpretation of Jubilees reflects a tone of alienation and bitterness absent in the composition of Jubilees. Thus we come to a series of observations based on implications and impressions that may be widely held by scholars, but still should be taken with a degree of reservation and a desideratum for more thorough study.

---

<sup>100</sup> Kugel proposed that the root בָּהַל in Psalm 90:7 could have been interpreted to mean, “in your wrath we are bewildered.” In this case, Psalm 90 could directly provide the elements of sin, wrath, mortality, and senility. This is an intriguing possibility, but one might legitimately desire evidence of such an understanding of בָּהַל prior to the Amoraic period. Pending further study, and in light of the other evidence that Jubilees was utilized in the composition of the Damascus Document, Jubilees remains a more likely direct source than Psalm 90. James L. Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 334.

Based only on a minimal interpretation of the paleography of 4Q216 and the use of Jubilees by the Damascus Document, one might still suggest that Jubilees was written as late as 101 BCE and then copied and used by the Qumran sectarians in 100 BCE. A number of observations suggest that a significant amount of time must have passed between the composition of Jubilees and the use of Jubilees by the Qumran sectarians. Almost all scholars accept that Jubilees is pre-sectarian or at least non-sectarian.<sup>101</sup> The positive view of the high priesthood and Jerusalem temple exclude an exile community at odds with the Hasmonean high-priesthood.<sup>102</sup> The legal differences are noteworthy, even though one might expect legal judgments to change over time within a community.<sup>103</sup> A more subjective, but ultimately persuasive, set of observations amounts to the generalization that *Jubilees does not present itself as sectarian*. As discussed in the chapter on the spatial axis, Jubilees does not divide Israel into groups, especially for purposes of salvation.<sup>104</sup> It presents its calendar as if it has always been in force and only

---

<sup>101</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 21. Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, 314. Werman is one recent exception. She does not deny the significant differences between Jubilees and the sectarian literature, but she argues that the differences can be accounted for by imagining that Jubilees was written for an external audience and the accepted sectarian literature written for an internal audience. Thus, for the purposes of propaganda, Jubilees makes the group look like brave heroes who stand up against evil, while in the internal forum there is no denying they were chased out and persecuted. One wonders when the initiates received the bad news. See note 110 below for Werman's response to the disparity in the basis of authority.

<sup>102</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 281.

<sup>103</sup> Lutz Doering, *Sabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 281. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 281. Also, some calendrical texts follow a schematic lunar calendar at odds with Jubilees. On an exegetical matter, 4Q252 "corrects" the flood chronology of Jubilees.

<sup>104</sup> Testuz, however, takes an exclusive group within Israel as the first point of connection between the Damascus Document and Jubilees. The textual evidence, a reference to the "elect ones of Israel" (Jubilees 1:29), could be easily explained as the election of all Israel or the election of the priests who serve in the Jerusalem temple under discussion. The positive view of the Jerusalem temple is in fact a very non-sectarian view. Testuz's better, but still flawed, argument comes from the assumption that the calendar of Jubilees was always necessarily sectarian. Even Testuz recognizes that Jubilees differs from the Damascus



recently challenged, and will be soon restored.<sup>105</sup> As has long been observed, Jubilees lacks the defensive and polemical tone and the general bitterness of the documents that are readily identified as sectarian.<sup>106</sup>

It has been suggested that the Qumran sectarians accepted no new writings (other than their own) after their foundation, and that they distinguished the authority of the more broadly received literature from the authority of their own group, particularly the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>107</sup> Whatever qualifications may come from more detailed study, the basic observation appears to hold up. Both the way Jubilees authorizes itself, and the way its authority is treated at Qumran suggest pre-sectarian composition of the Book of Jubilees. Jubilees makes no mention of the Teacher of Righteousness or any charismatic individual, but rather derives its authority from received authoritative literature, the genre “apocalypse” and a variation on pseudepigraphy. The authors of the sectarian documents seem not to have employed the genre “apocalypse”<sup>108</sup> or pseudepigraphy of this type,<sup>109</sup> drawing rather on the authority of the Teacher of

---

Document in that the former community is not yet separated from the rest of the people, while the latter assumes a closed community in exile. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 180-183.

<sup>105</sup> Zeitlin made this point but assumed that the calendar debate had been “long dead” by the Maccabean period. Zeitlin, “The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance,” 14-15.

<sup>106</sup> “It is especially noteworthy that the Book of Jubilees reflects none of the bitterness which was engendered by the break between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.” Finkelstein, “Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded),” 23. The same point had been made by Zeitlin. Zeitlin, “The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance,” 1-31.

<sup>107</sup> Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 161 n.76.

<sup>108</sup> Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 404. David E. Aune, “Qumran and the Book of Revelation,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 626.

<sup>109</sup> “Of the presence of pseudepigraphic texts at Qumran there can be no doubt, since the ‘library’ possessed multiple copies of Jubilees and 1 Enoch as well as testament-type works. It is important to note that neither of these works is claimed by scholars to be of Qumranic origin. Moreover, I believe that one could argue that fully-pseudepigraphic works such as these were not composed at Qumran. It might even be

Righteousness.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, the Qumran sectarians seem to have treated Jubilees the same way they treated other authoritative literature. 4Q228 cites Jubilees with the same citation formula that otherwise is only used to introduce works that were eventually included in the Hebrew canon (with perhaps one exception, a reference to an unknown work, “Levi, son of Jacob”).<sup>111</sup> Even within the Damascus Document, Jubilees is treated rather like scripture. Column 16 assumes the authority of Jubilees, and the term פרוש may specifically connote authoritative literature of the received variety.<sup>112</sup> Likewise, in column 10 Jubilees is assumed as an authority for a rule. This same passage, however, may point to an interpretive distance between the author of Jubilees and the interpreter of Jubilees in the Damascus Document. The wrath of God is turned up, and the optimism that things are already gradually improving is turned down.

It can be dangerous to speak from generalizations and impressions of sectarian origins and the status of scripture. It can also be dangerous to lose sight of the big picture. However it may best be described and defended, Jubilees is a thoroughly pre-sectarian

---

claimed, based on the authoritative status of Jubilees within other Qumran texts, that its pseudepigraphy was taken at face value, that is, that its ascription to Moses was accepted just as Second Temple authors generally accepted the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.” Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick, and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 9.

<sup>110</sup> Werman explains the differences in authority according to the assumed audience. For external propaganda, the authority of the charismatic founder could not be assumed. This assumption seems not to be verified by phenomenology of charismatic movements. The early Christians, for example, seem not have suppressed their opinion of their central figure when recruiting new members.

<sup>111</sup> James C. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5, no. 3 (1998): 396.

<sup>112</sup> VanderKam on the citation of Jubilees in CD 16, “That the word *perush* (‘the exact determinations’) is employed is probably also significant: elsewhere it is associated with biblical books. The term translated ‘strictly defined’ is used in the first line of the same column in connection with the Law of Moses.” VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 154.

document. Some span of transmission must separate its composition from its use and copying by the Damascus Document group at the turn of the century. Jubilees could not have been composed as late as the last decade of the century. In my estimation, the same logic prohibits a date in the 120s, and furthermore any time after the establishment of the Teacher of Righteousness as a charismatic leader of a sect. If there are any cases of literature at Qumran that is neither received as authoritative literature at the origin of the community nor composed by the sectarians, those cases do not begin to match the extent to which Jubilees was used and copied at Qumran.

### 3.3.2. Texts which Jubilees assumes

Jubilees reflects knowledge of a number of traditions which can be found in texts dated to the second century, but with the Enochic literature in particular we find specific references to datable texts. From the description of the writings of Enoch in Jubilees 4 we can be confident that the composition of Jubilees postdates the composition of the Book of the Watchers, some form of an Enochic Astronomical Book, and the Animal Apocalypse.<sup>113</sup> It also seems reasonably likely that Jubilees indicates awareness of the entire Book of Dreams and all or part (introduction, the Apocalypse of Weeks) of the

---

<sup>113</sup> James C. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 114, 119. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001), 72. Michael A. Knibb, "Which Parts of 1 Enoch Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16-25," in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum, H. G. M. Williamson, and David J. A. Clines, JSOTSup 373 (London; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 260.

Epistle.<sup>114</sup> Although the evidence of knowledge of the Book of the Watchers and a form of the Astronomical Book is most clear, these points of reference do not help us narrow a date within the second century BCE.<sup>115</sup> The Animal Apocalypse is the best case for narrowing a date for the composition of Jubilees after 165 BCE.

Jubilees refers to and reflects parallels with the Animal Apocalypse. While Jubilees 4:18 may fit better with the Apocalypse of Weeks and/or a version of the Astronomical Book, 4:19 refers directly to a dream encompassing the whole of human history.

ወዘከነ : ወዘይከውን : ርእየ : በራእየ : ንዋሙ : ዘከመ : ይከውን : ዲበ :  
 ደቂቀ : እንሰ : እመሕያው : በትውልደሙ : እስከ : አመ : ዕለተ : ደይን :  
 ኩሎ : ርእየ : ወእኒመረ :: ወጸሐፎ : ስምዐ : ወእንበሮ : ዲበ : ምድር : ላዕለ :  
 ኩሎ : ደቂቀ : እንሰ : እመሕያው : ወለትውልደሙ ::

[JCVK] While he slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur—how things will happen for mankind during their history until the day of judgment. He saw everything and understood. He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history. (Jubilees 4:19)

The specific language of “testimony” may suggest the Apocalypse of Weeks, but the emphasis on the dream fits better with the Animal Apocalypse.<sup>116</sup> The Animal

---

<sup>114</sup> The strongest argument for a reflection of the Apocalypse of Weeks or the entire Epistle comes from Jubilees 4:18 (see also 4:19; 7:29 and 10:17), which describes a testimony for mankind concerning the weeks of the jubilees. The use of the term “testimony” is suggestive, but Jubilees 4:18 implies calendrical testimony more than the testimony based on the division of history into weeks found in the Apocalypse of Weeks. Perhaps the “testimony” in 4:19 suggests an additional historical testimony, rather than a reprise of the calendrical testimony. VanderKam and Nickelsburg favor the likelihood that Jubilees refers to at least parts of the Epistle (the testamentary opening [93:1-2] and the Apocalypse of Weeks), while Knibb considers the evidence dubious. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 114. Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 72. Knibb, “Which Parts of 1 Enoch Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16-25,” 261.

<sup>115</sup> Allusions and parallels to these works appear in Jubilees 4:15-26; 5:1-12; 7:20-39; 8:1-4; and 10:1-17.

<sup>116</sup> VanderKam also suggests that “until” would fit better with the Apocalypse of Weeks because it develops less of what happens *after* the judgment. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 114.

Apocalypse also offers a more detailed assessment of what will happen during human history. Jubilees also parallels the Animal Apocalypse in other passages. Both the Animal Apocalypse (85:3) and Jubilees 4:20 give the name of Enoch's wife as Edna (the last vowel is confirmed by Qumran manuscripts), and place the dream vision before Enoch's marriage. Jubilees 7:22 also parallels the Animal Apocalypse 86:4 in specifying three classes of giants. As the rest of this dissertation will show, it is easy to imagine that the author of Jubilees held the Animal Apocalypse as a prime model of the genre "apocalypse" and the apocalyptic worldview. Even if some of these traditions could have been transmitted independent of the Animal Apocalypse, the cumulative evidence helps secure a date for the composition of Jubilees after the Animal Apocalypse.<sup>117</sup> Although a form of the tradition may go back to the third century, the Animal Apocalypse as we have it can be firmly dated to 165-160 BCE.<sup>118</sup> For confirmation that Jubilees knows, or at least could have known, a form of the Animal Apocalypse from the 160s BCE we turn to the historical circumstances and events reflected in Jubilees.

---

<sup>117</sup> Ruiten observes that Jubilees does not copy the Book of Dreams word for word, and concludes from this that Jubilees knows the traditions but not the text. The situation is similar with the Book of the Watchers and the Astronomical Book. Yet, the number of non-linguistic parallels, along with the image of Enoch as a writer of books and the literary nature of the works in question, strongly suggest that Jubilees knows, but does not copy, these Enochic texts. J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, "A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch?," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 90-93.

<sup>118</sup> Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 360-361, 398. Patrick A. Tillier, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 78-79.

### 3.3.3. Historical circumstances and events reflected in the concerns, images and language of Jubilees

A number of issues and images in the Book of Jubilees match with issues and events which can be dated from external sources to the 160s BCE. To be sure, Jubilees stays generally within the setting of the ancient narrative, and only rarely turns to the interpretation of current events. Only in chapter 23 can we significantly rely on the general principle for dating apocalypses, identifying the last event to have actually occurred (chapter 1 offers less specificity). Even here, however, scholars have read different events into the vague allusions. Before turning to Jubilees 23, we will consider the extent to which the concerns with nakedness and circumcision narrow the date of composition, and the extent to which the wars of the patriarchs echo the Maccabean wars. The cumulative consideration of all the evidence suggests a date of composition following 159 BCE, but any one argument remains assailable on its own. The arguments against a date following 159 BCE consist mainly of reminders that one point or another is ambiguous, and assertions that other dates remain possible. Be that as it may, no positive argument or series of probabilities can establish a later date.

The better question is not what decade is the single most likely date for the composition of Jubilees, but how certain we can be with this date. In my opinion it is not the alleged alternative evidence that limits our certainty, but the methodological limitations inherent in the imbalance of sources available to us. There is no doubt that the issues and images in Jubilees parallel issues and images in 1 and 2 Maccabees. But are we seeing puppy dogs in clouds? If we had as detailed sources of the wars of Hyrcanus would we find as many parallels? Is it possible that major events during the

intersacerdotium were capriciously lost to history? This limitation is real and needs to be kept in mind, but is not in itself an argument for another date. Furthermore, several of the arguments below identify when something was most likely to be an issue, not the only time it could have been an issue. Concerns with circumcision, nakedness, and certain hostile neighbors could have been penned at any time in the second century BCE.<sup>119</sup> The author could have been reacting to a problem that only later climaxed into a bigger problem. In the other direction, the author could have used a source that reacts to a crisis that died down considerably by the time of the composition of Jubilees itself. These are the limitations of knowledge inherent in the study of antiquity, and are not reasons to abandon the most probable in favor of the merely possible. The limitations do not excuse us from considering the Book of Jubilees within the historical context of the most likely decade of composition.

The Book of Jubilees is concerned with issues that were contested by an assimilationist party within Judaism and the external forces of Antiochus Epiphanes. Chief among these are the prohibition of public nudity and the insistence on infant circumcision.<sup>120</sup> The first of these issues appears in Jubilees primarily in 3:30-31 and 7:20.

**ወለአዳም ፡ ባሕቲቱ ፡ ወሀቦ ፡ ይክድን ፡ ኃፍረቶ ፡ እምኩሉ ፡ አራዊት ፡  
ወእንስሳ ፡፡ በእንተዝ ፡ ተአዘዘ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ጽላት ፡ ላዕለ ፡ ኩሎሙ ፡ እለ ፡  
ያእምሩ ፡ ፍትሐ ፡ ሕግ ፡ ይክድኑ ፡ ኃፍረቶሙ ፡ ወኢይትከሠቱ ፡ ከመ ፡  
አሕዛብ ፡ ይትከሠቱ ፡፡**

---

<sup>119</sup> As noted by Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 89.

<sup>120</sup> Further potentially datable issues include the enforcement of eating non-kosher food in 2 Macc 6:7, the commandment of idolatry in 1 Macc 1:47, and the prohibition of sabbath observance in 1 Macc 1:45. The issue of war on the Sabbath in Jubilees 50:12 parallels the issue in 1 Macc 2:31-38.

[JCVK] But of all the animals and cattle he permitted Adam alone to cover his shame. For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.

(Jubilees 3:30-31)

ወበዕሥራ : ወሰማኒቱ : ኢዮቤልወሳት : አኀዘ : ኖኅ : የአዝዝ : ለውሉደ :  
ውሉዱ : ሥርዓተ : ወትእዛዛተ : ኩሎ : ዘያአምር : ፍትሐ : ወአስምዐ :  
ላዕለ : ውሉዱ : ከመ : ይግበሩ : ጽድቀ : ወከመ : ይክድኑ : ኃፍረተ :  
ሥጋሆሙ : ወከመ : ይባርክዎ : ለዘ : ፈጠሮሙ : ወያክብሩ : አበ : ወእመ :  
ወያፍቅሩ : አሐዱ : አሐዱ : ቢጾ : ወይዕቀቡ : ነፍሶሙ : እምዝሙት :  
ወርኩስ : ወእምኩሉ : ዐመፃ ::

[JCVK] During the twenty-eighth jubilee [1324-72] Noah began to prescribe for his grandsons the ordinances and the commandments—every statute which he knew. He testified to his sons that they should do what is right, cover the shame of their bodies, bless the one who had created them, honor father and mother, love one another, and keep themselves from fornication, uncleanness, and from all injustice. (Jubilees 7:20)

Much could be said about the interpretation in these verses of the source material in Genesis and Leviticus, and the implied legal status of the sons of Adam and Noah who should know but do not know the law. The point that helps with dating Jubilees is that these verses concern not only nakedness, but the nakedness distinctive to the gentiles, which matches the Hellenistic custom of naked athletics and exercise.<sup>121</sup> Again, this could have been an issue at practically any time in the second century, but is known to have been particularly an issue in the disputes culminating in the Maccabean revolt. 1 Macc 1:10-15 dates to 175 BCE the rise of an assimilationist movement that, among other

---

<sup>121</sup> Kister has argued that the concern in Jubilees with nakedness need not suggest a Hellenistic assimilation movement, but could rather describe the halakhic differences within Judaism that distinguish the Essenes. Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 6-7 n.26. The specific emphasis in Jubilees that this kind of nakedness is characteristic of the gentiles, however, strongly suggests the γυμνάσιον rather than scatological halakhic disputes. Yet there may still be a relationship between the early response to the γυμνάσιον and the later, more extreme, prohibition of all forms of nakedness, even privately. It seems plausible that the earlier prohibition may have been taken more and more literally and absolutely, leading to the later legal material. Although we have seen some studies that consider Jubilees as legal interpretation of older material, it seems very possible that Jubilees itself became the basis of legal interpretation, only later producing the specific concerns with nakedness that distinguish the Essenes.



things, built a naked center in Jerusalem according to the custom of the nations (ᾠκοδόμησαν γυμνάσιον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις κατὰ τὰ νόμιμα τῶν ἐθνῶν [1 Macc 10:14, similarly 2 Macc 4:9]).<sup>122</sup> Although Greek customs such as naked athletics could have been an issue earlier or later, the specific challenge over the issue between major groups in Judaism is only documented under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>123</sup> The issue of nakedness is one among many reasons to believe that Jubilees was written partly as a reaction to the assimilationist movement described in 1 Macc 1.<sup>124</sup>

A similar but slightly more complex situation exists in chapter 15 when Jubilees expands on the circumcision of Abraham. Kister has correctly observed that 15:25-26 would not make sense directed against a Hellenizing assimilationist party that rejected circumcision altogether, as described in 1 Macc 1.<sup>125</sup>

ወዘሕግ : ለኩሉ : ትውልድ : ዘለዓለም : ወአልቦ : ክስብተ : መዋዕል ::  
 ወአልቦ : ተዐድዎ : አሐተ : ዕለተ : እምሰማኒ : መዋዕል : እስመ : ሥርዓት :  
 ዘለዓለም : ውእቱ : ሥሩዕ : ወጽሑፍ : ውስተ : ጽላተ : ሰማይ ::

[JCVK] This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. (Jubilees 15:25)

---

<sup>122</sup> The literal translation of γυμνάσιον into English as gymnasium does not adequately convey the implication in Greek, but not English, of nakedness.

<sup>123</sup> Finkelstein perhaps overestimates the extent to which Hellenistic customs involving nudity were purged from Israel by the Maccabean wars, but whatever issues of cultural exchange and assimilation may have continued to occur among individuals and smaller groups, the assimilationist movement described in 1 Macc 1 is unique in the second century. Finkelstein, “Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded),” 20. See also, Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 90. Werman, however, asserts that the anti-Hellenistic polemic in Jubilees is better explained by issues within the court of John Hyrcanus at the end of the century. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 38-39.

<sup>124</sup> VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 20-22.

<sup>125</sup> Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 6-7 n.26.

Verse 26 goes on to threaten that one who is not circumcised on the eighth day will be counted as a gentile, which would hardly concern one who sought to make a covenant with the gentiles and undo all forms of separation (1 Macc 1:11).<sup>126</sup> It is not essential that we reconstruct the other side of the dispute from the Mishnah, which allows an exception to the eight day count in the event of illness or the Sabbath. From Jubilees alone it certainly stands to reason that the opponent in 15:25 circumcises at the wrong time, but does not reject circumcision on principle. We cannot stop there, however, and assume that because Jubilees is concerned with the halakhic matter of the proper time for circumcision that Jubilees is not also concerned with those who refuse to circumcise at all. If 15:25 addresses those who circumcise on the wrong day (out of laxity or differing legal traditions, perhaps with some interpretation of Exodus 4:25), 15:33a addresses those who circumcise in the wrong way, and 15:33b-34 addresses those who forego circumcision altogether in order to make themselves like the nations.

ወኩሎሙ : ውሉደ : ቤልኣር : የጎድጉ : ውሉደሙ : ዘእንበለ : ክስበት :  
 በከመ : ተወልዱ :: ወትከውን : መዓት : ላዕለ : ውሉደ : እስራኤል : ዐባይ :  
 እምነበ : እግዚአብሔር : እስመ : ጎደጉ : ኪዳኖ : ወእምቃሉ : ተግኅሡ :  
 ወወሐኩ : ወፀረፉ : በከመ : ኢገብሩ : ሥርዓቶ : ለዝ : ትእምርት :: እስመ :  
 ገብሩ : ነፍሳቲሆሙ : ከመ : አሕዛብ...

[JCVK] All the people of Belial will leave their sons uncircumcised just as they were born. Then there will be great anger from the Lord against the Israelites because they neglected his covenant, departed from his word, provoked, and blasphemed in that they did not perform the ordinance of this sign. For they have made themselves like the nations...  
 (Jubilees 15:33-34)

---

<sup>126</sup> Kister is correct to find a polemical amplification here, but it should be noted that the Septuagint and Samaritan versions of Genesis 17:14 also specify “on the eighth day,” as do Genesis 17:12 and Leviticus 12:3 in all recensions.

Thus, Jubilees has more than one concern regarding circumcision, but one of them is a group of Israelites who deliberately avoid circumcision in order to make a covenant with the foreign nations, leading to punishment of all Israel (presumably by an outside force).<sup>127</sup> Although a general concern with circumcision could be dated to anytime in the second century BCE, the **ⲉⲗⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲗⲁⲓ** (literally: children of Beliar) parallel in particular the υἱοὶ παράνομοι who undid their circumcisions (1 Macc 1:11, 15).<sup>128</sup>

It is clear enough that Jubilees was composed after 175 and not so late that resentment of the assimilationist party subsided (although that alone does not limit greatly the latest possible date). A further question, going back to Finkelstein and Rowley, is whether Jubilees knows the decrees of Antiochus of 167 BCE.<sup>129</sup> As we shall see again in more detail when we consider Jubilees 23, I believe that Jubilees does indeed postdate the persecution of Antiochus, but downplays it as the consequence of the internal problem of Jewish infidelity, not the cause of the problem in itself.<sup>130</sup> In Jubilees

---

<sup>127</sup> It may also be tempting to find in Jubilees a condemnation of the “forced” circumcision/conversion of Idumea by John Hyrcanus (*Antiquities* 13.257). Himmelfarb is certainly correct that Jubilees rejects intermarriage and it may even follow that Jubilees rejects conversion to Judaism. However, I do not find any reference to conversion in Jubilees 15. Although circumcision of “one born in your house” is required on the 8<sup>th</sup> day, Jubilees 15:12 in fact endorses the circumcision of non-descendents of Abraham. Although intermarriage and conversion may have been issues especially so during the time of Hyrcanus, it does not follow that Jubilees could only have been written during this time. Martha Himmelfarb, “Jubilees and Sectarianism,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2005), 131.

<sup>128</sup> Forms of παράνομος translate בליעל twelve times in the Septuagint.

<sup>129</sup> Rowley holds that the concern with circumcision in Jubilees requires a date after the decrees of Antiochus in 167 BCE. Finkelstein holds a date between the rise of the assimilationist party in 175 and the events of 167, which included the enforced ban on circumcision. Finkelstein, “Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded),” 23-24. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 90.

<sup>130</sup> John Collins noted along the same lines, “The crisis perceived in Jubilees, however, is not the political crisis or the persecution, which dominates the book of Daniel. It is rather the crisis of piety, occasioned by the neglect of the solar calendar and disregard for the laws. The crisis is primarily within the Jewish community.” Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 84.

15 we do indeed find persecution by Antiochus, but reduced to, “Then there will be great anger from the Lord against the Israelites” (15:34). The portrayal of Antiochus in Jubilees does differ from that of 1 Maccabees, which places less emphasis on the internal division (1 Macc 1:11-15), and more emphasis on Antiochus as the external aggressor and oppressor against a united Israel (1 Macc 1:43-63, especially 48 and 60). If one accepts uncritically the portrayal of Antiochus in 1 Maccabees (and Daniel), it may indeed seem strange to reduce Antiochus’ decrees of 167 to “punishment from the Lord” in the Deuteronomistic sense. Yet even from 1 Maccabees,<sup>131</sup> and more so from 2 Maccabees<sup>132</sup> and Josephus,<sup>133</sup> one can easily imagine how the author of Jubilees, writing after 159 BCE, could look back on Antiochus as a pawn used by God to punish the infidelity of Israel. Jubilees, in chapter 15 and elsewhere, de-emphasizes Antiochus, but that does not mean Jubilees was unaware of all the events of his reign. The treatment of circumcision in Jubilees 15 suggests (among other things) an internal Jewish movement against circumcision and at least some of the persecution of Antiochus. Although the sources reflect some confusion in the exact chronology, it does seem that the persecution of Antiochus came in installments of worsening deeds and decrees. Based on chapter 15

---

<sup>131</sup> In addition to 1 Maccabees 1:11-15, the assimilationist movement appears again to compromise the emphasis on Antiochus as instigator in 1 Macc 1:43, 52; 2:16, 23, and 46.

<sup>132</sup> See especially 2 Maccabees 5:17 and 6:12.

<sup>133</sup> Interestingly, Josephus also downplays the culpability of Antiochus and emphasizes the internal division in Israel as root cause (see especially, *War* 1.31). One might argue that Josephus had other reasons for writing his history in his own way, but it is also clear that Josephus has access to sources beyond 1 Maccabees (perhaps even accounts handed down within his own family), and could quite plausibly have read critically the agenda of 1 Maccabees. Louis H. Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with 1 Maccabees,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, ed. Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 41-42. See also, Isaiah Gafni, “Josephus and I Maccabees,” in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 116-131.

alone, Jubilees might conceivably date after the initial attacks but before the worst. As we shall see from how Jubilees imagines the wars of the patriarchs and from the historical apocalypse of chapter 23, Jubilees could not have been written in 168 BCE.

#### 3.3.4. Wars

Bohn was the first to date Jubilees by synchronizing the wars in Jubilees with the Maccabean wars, and the most thorough attempt to date Jubilees, VanderKam's 1977 *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, builds significantly on parallels in geographic details of battles.<sup>134</sup> Although the certainty of VanderKam's argument has been questioned from various angles, no more thorough or more persuasive positive argument has been put forward as an alternative explanation for the battle details in Jubilees that cannot be explained from Genesis.<sup>135</sup> The details of the arguments, and the limits of their reliability, have already been thoroughly documented and do not lend themselves to summary. Three general points will suffice to review the high probability that Jubilees reflects knowledge of the Maccabean battles of 163 and 161 BCE.

---

<sup>134</sup> Bohn, "Die Bedeutung des Buches der Jubiläen," 167-184. Bohn was quickly followed by Charles. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 217-246.

<sup>135</sup> Doran invokes literary theory to argue that, because Jubilees 34-38 has a literary function, it cannot tell us anything about the historical background of the author. Doran does not document what literary theorist holds these to be mutually exclusive. Doran's argument would be a valid corrective to anyone who holds that the purpose of these chapters of Jubilees is exclusively to retell recent history in prophecy after the fact. Robert Doran, "The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34-38; 23:14-32 in Narrative Context," *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1-11.

From the other extreme, Mendels might give the impression that Jubilees was written as a manifesto of territorial expansionism. Mendels is correct that Jubilees is concerned with the relationship between Jacob and Esau, but the Pentateuch itself, along with a number of conflicts in the second century, could explain this concern. Mendels, *Land of Israel as a Political Concept*, 74, 87.

First, there were many conflicts in the second century BCE Levant and there are many conflicts in Jubilees. The presence of a conflict alone is not grounds for dating. This is all the more so given the above consideration that the ancient author lacked our perspective on what was *the* conflict between two groups in the century.<sup>136</sup>

Second, the parallels VanderKam has shown between the wars in Jubilees and the battles of the 160s BCE are specific and unique. Mendels reminds us that Jubilees is not an exact retelling of 1 Maccabees, but his criticism of the details of VanderKam's argument is trumped by the lack of details of his own argument. Mendels relies on the objection that it is not fair to compare details of periods for which we do not have equal amounts of data.<sup>137</sup> Hyrcanus' territorial expansion of 129 BCE<sup>138</sup> is one good example of

---

<sup>136</sup> Finkelstein reads Jubilees 46 to indicate the Seleucid-Ptolemaic conflict under Antiochus III early in the century. Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)," 20-21.

Charles finds parallels to historical events throughout the second century, the latest of which suggest Hyrcanus' conquests of Samaria and Edom around 109 BCE, based on statements about Shechem and Esau in Jubilees 30:4-6 and 38:14. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 6.

Charlesworth rejects Charles' claim, and argues that Jubilees must have been written before 109 BCE, reading 38:14 as a reflection of an ongoing problem, not resolved by Hyrcanus. Charlesworth, "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll," 194.

Milik reads the same story to suggest a date no earlier than 128-125 BCE. Jozef T. Milik and Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 58 n. 1.

Berger identifies Jubilees 45:6-11 (closing up the gates of Egypt) with the Death of Ptolemy IV in 145 BCE. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 300.

Alexander finds the anti-Canaanite tone of Jubilees 10:30-32 to evidence the territorial expansion of the Hasmonean state. Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, ed. Donald A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge, England: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988), 102-103.

Testuz links the hatred of the Philistines in Jubilees to the attacks of Jonathan and Hyrcanus. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 34.

<sup>137</sup> Mendels, *Land of Israel as a Political Concept*, 80.

a historical situation that would have inspired reflection on the relationship between Israel and its neighbors, but it is not the only example. The evidence preserved fails to indicate unique parallels between Jubilees and historical events under Hyrcanus. The parallels with the early Maccabean wars may not all be as clear as we would like, but there are specific parallels and no contradictions that rule out the possibility.

The fact that not all the parallels are of equal weight brings us to a final general point. We can reasonably conclude that the author of Jubilees was not trying to give an exact account of recent wars in a more ancient historical setting. Rather, it seems that the influence was closer to sub-conscious. The author of Jubilees, having lived through wars between Israel and its neighbors, imagined that the patriarchs must have had similar conflicts with their neighbors, and that they must have played out over the same key locations. The tendency to project later developments onto ancient eponymous figures already exists in Genesis, so it is hardly surprising that Jubilees expands this tendency. The point is not that Jubilees is centrally concerned with interpreting recent history, the point is that historical context influenced the concerns and images of Jubilees, and that the events of the 160s BCE best explain those concerns and images.

### 3.3.5. Possible and probable historical allusions in Jubilees 23

Finally we come to the section of Jubilees which offers the most details in the form of the historical apocalypse. In chapter 23 of Jubilees we find the possibilities and difficulties that one often finds in assigning a date to historical apocalypses. On one hand,

---

<sup>138</sup> *Antiquities* 13.254-258 tells of Hyrcanus in Transjordan, Samaria, and Idumea after the death of Antiochus VII Sidetes in 129 BCE. Compare Jubilees 34:2-9 and 38:1-14.

Jubilees describes a sequence of historical events, followed by a sequence of non-historical events. To the extent that we can identify the events that actually occurred before the inaccurate or impossible historical claims begin, we can identify the date of composition. On the other hand, the genre calls for vague or symbolic allusions, voiced as ancient predictions (or predestinations) of later events. As the history of religions school, and especially Gunkel, remind us, these views of history are not created from scratch but by reshaping timeless myths with changing circumstances. Even if an image had a historical referent at one stage, it may have persisted only as a vague image in a later version, making it impossible simply to “decode” a historical apocalypse. Thus even a historical apocalypse is as often marked by timelessness as much as timeliness. It would be no efficient task to review and critique every alternative reading of Jubilees 23.<sup>139</sup> The overall argument does not depend on specific claims about the historical referents in Jubilees 23. Yet Jubilees 23 does help establish a date of composition in the 150s BCE. Further, since the chapter will be important for other parts of the dissertation, it is worth considering in some detail the possible and likely historical allusions behind the chapter.

Our best sources for the time of Antiochus Epiphanes are 1 and 2 Maccabees, but neither should be mistaken for objective history. Not only do they agree in a clearly biased perspective, portraying the faithful Jews united behind Judah Maccabee in resisting foreign tyranny and a handful of traitors, they disagree with each other on a number of accounts. Daniel, the Animal Apocalypse, Josephus and other sources potentially aid historical reconstruction on specific points (such as the fate of the last

---

<sup>139</sup> For a creative challenge to the scholarly mainstream, see Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 37-55. Wacholder denies that Jubilees 23 refers to historical events of the second century BCE. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, 244.



Oniads).<sup>140</sup> Caution and efficiency, however, demand that we avoid the disputed details and focus on the broader patterns. Incidental details support the argument only to the extent to which they can be extricated from the bias of the sources. Similarly, Jubilees has its own bias. We cannot assume that the righteous and wicked of one source correspond to the righteous and the wicked of another source, or that there were only two positions or groups on any particular issue. Rather, we begin with the basic pattern in Jubilees 23 and build specificity from there. The basic pattern of the “recent history” verses of Jubilees 23 is as follows: a dispute between Jewish groups over religious authority leads to serious violence in which many Jews are killed; neither group is innocent and the violence fails to establish a legitimate high priesthood; as a result of these events a gentile army invades and causes great destruction; thereafter a (probably non-violent) group studies the law properly, which is credited with initiating an improved situation.

From there we move to the details of Jubilees 23:16-27. Block text from Jubilees 23 is presented in bold. For economy of space and due to the historical rather than literary nature of the parallels, this sub-section will quote texts in English only.

**[JCVK] 23:16 During that generation the children will find fault with their fathers and elders because of sin and injustice, because of what they say and the great evils that they commit, and because of their abandoning the covenant which the Lord had made between them and himself so that they should observe and perform all his commands, ordinances, and all his laws without deviating to the left or right.**

---

<sup>140</sup> For more on the historical sources and their problems, see Daniel J. Harrington, *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* (Wilmington, Delaware: M. Glazier, 1988).. On the particular issue of the last Oniads, perhaps the best of the many discussions of the contradictory evidence is James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 214-222.

The text does not make clear whether the ones guilty of sin and injustice are the youths, the elders, or both, and we should not be quick to assume that the “children” are righteous in accusing their elders. Although the Animal Apocalypse and the Damascus Document more clearly side with the youths, we should not assume Jubilees is referring to the same conflict or shares the same perspective. In fact, a number of incidents could match with youths accusing elders.

This verse could match with Simon making accusations against the high priest of the elder generation, Onias.

Simon... made false accusation that it was Onias who threatened Heliodorus and instigated the whole miserable affair. (2 Macc 4:1)

In this case, it would seem likely that the author of Jubilees would have shared the view of 2 Maccabees that it was not Onias but the accusers who were guilty of sin and injustice.

Although “abandoning the covenant with the Lord” could be a generic epithet for one whose religious ideas differ from one’s own, the accusation particularly fits the movement described in 2 Macc 4:10-17 and 1 Macc 1:11-15,

<sup>11</sup> In those days certain renegades (υἱοὶ παράνομοι) came out from Israel and misled many, saying, “Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles around us, for since we separated from them many disasters have come upon us.” <sup>12</sup> This proposal pleased them, <sup>13</sup> and some of the people eagerly went to the king, who authorized them to observe the ordinances of the Gentiles. <sup>14</sup> So they built a gymnasium in Jerusalem, according to Gentile custom, <sup>15</sup> and removed the marks of circumcision, and abandoned the holy covenant. They joined with the Gentiles and sold themselves to do evil. (1 Macc 1:11-15)

Yet another possibility could fit with the image of a group of upstart youths revolting against the elder, ruling authority. Although 1 and 2 Maccabees portray Judah Maccabee rising up against foreign persecution and a handful of Jewish traitors, a critical

reading of 1 Maccabees shows that the Maccabean revolt was in no small part an internal dispute. According to this scenario we might imagine that those “guilty of sin and injustice” were Jason and Menelaus, but if we look past the hagiographic bias of 1-2 Maccabees, we have reason to believe that the author of Jubilees had halakhic qualms with Judah Maccabee. From other parts of Jubilees we know that the author would not have approved of Judah fighting on the sabbath (Jubilees 50:12, *contra* 1 Macc 2:40). From the continuation it becomes clear that Jubilees disapproves of *all* of the Jewish groups involved in violence against other Jews.

Jubilees 23:16 may be intentionally multivalent, but among the possible candidates for the accusing youths are the υἱοὶ παράνομοι of 1 Macc 1:11, the party led by Judah, or even the party led by Simon.<sup>141</sup>

**23:17 For all have acted wickedly; every mouth speaks what is sinful. Everything that they do is impure and something detestable; all their ways are (characterized by) contamination, and corruption.**

1-2 Maccabees certainly make the case for describing Jason and Menelaus as sinful, but “all” indicates that Jubilees condemns not just one side but the entire civil conflict. Even based on 1 Maccabees it is easy to imagine that quite a few Jews could have found the violent rampages of Mattathias and Judah against other Jews inappropriate (e.g., 1 Macc 2:44).<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Other scholars: For examples of scholarship that seeks parallels between the accusation here and those in the Animal Apocalypse and Qumran sectarian documents, see Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” esp. 8-9. Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 37-55. Rofé assumes this verse identifies the elders with the sinners and fits a larger pattern of ageism distinctive of the Essenes and Qumran sect. Alexander Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Ruth Clements, John J. Collins, and Gregory E. Sterling, STDJ 51 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 3-4. This dissertation in general is challenging the tendency to flatten the distinctive features of Jubilees into those of contemporary apocalypses and the sectarian documents of Qumran.

<sup>142</sup> Other scholars: Testuz thinks Jubilees approves of the “holy war.” Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 34.

**23:18 The earth will indeed be destroyed because of all that they do. There will be no produce from the vine and no oil because what they do (constitutes) complete disobedience. All will be destroyed together—animals, cattle, birds, and all fish of the sea—because of mankind.**

If we seek confirmation of such a famine in the historical sources we may find it in the famine of 1 Macc 9:23 (160 BCE), or perhaps 1 Macc 6:54 (c. 162 BCE), which is dubiously attributed by 1 Macc to the sabbatical year.<sup>143</sup> The first part could be explained as the direct effect of Judah's destructive tour through the land, whereas the natural famine would fit with the broader notion that God punishes the Jewish civil war first with famine and then with chastisement by foreigners.

**23:19 One group will struggle with another—the young with the old, the old with the young; the poor with the rich, the lowly with the great; and the needy with the ruler—regarding the law and the covenant. For they have forgotten commandment, covenant, festival, month, sabbath, jubilee, and every verdict.**

In light of the next verse it is likely that this verse refers to an overt struggle between two parties rather than general halakhic chaos in the absence of religious authority, although the latter is not out of the question. It is important to note that Jubilees approves of neither party; both have abandoned the commanded calendar. Again the allusion could be general, referring to the entire time of civil strife in Israel. If one looks for more specific allusions at least two possibilities present themselves. On the earlier end, the riot of Lysimachus and the violent encounter between Jason and Menelaus would both count as Jewish groups struggling with each other (2 Macc 5:5-7). We have no particular reason to believe that this struggle was aligned with class, but that may have

---

<sup>143</sup> Pastor defends the historical reliability of the account. Jack Pastor, "The Famine in 1 Maccabees: History or Apology?," in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 118 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 31-43.

been, or Jubilees could be using a literary flourish to express widespread civil strife. The other major possibility appears in 161 BCE when the supporters of Alcimus clashed violently with the supporters of Judah Maccabee (1 Macc 7). It does seem that all of the above groups would have used (or have gone on to use) a luni-solar calendar, so the statement that all the sides abandoned the commanded calendar does not limit the historical possibilities.

**23:20 They will stand up with swords and warfare in order to bring them back to the way; but they will not be brought back until much blood is shed on the earth by each group.**

This verse illustrates Jubilees' assessment of the futility of the civil war. Given the earlier possibility, one could say that Jason (a relatively legitimate high priest) stood up with swords and warfare to bring Jerusalem back to the right way from Menelaus (2 Macc 5:5-7). The continuation fits as well. Although Jason temporarily succeeded in taking Jerusalem and "then slaughtered his fellow citizens without mercy..., he did not gain control of the government" (2 Macc 5:6-7). Similarly, the fighting between the supporters of Alcimus and the supporters of Judah in 161 BCE (1 Macc 7) could be seen as ineffective at anything but slaughter. 1 Maccabees does not portray Alcimus as one who makes any serious claim to bring anyone back to the right way, but some seem to have acknowledged him as a relatively legitimate high priest (1 Macc 7:13-14). Alcimus may have been more successful than Jason at retaining the high priesthood (1 Macc 7:21), but he certainly did not succeed in unifying the Jews.

**23:21 Those who escape will not turn from their wickedness to the right way**

This verse teases specificity, but in fact several candidates could be accused of escaping and defiling the holy of holies. Menelaus escapes from Jason to the citadel in 2

Macc 5:5, and Jason takes refuge in 2 Macc 5:7. Judah escapes often, particularly from Apollonius (2 Macc 5:24), the conspiracy of Alcimus (1 Macc 7:11), and likewise Nicanor (1 Macc 7:30).

**because all of them will elevate themselves for (the purpose of) cheating and through wealth so that one takes everything that belongs to another.**

Jason, Menelaus and Alcimus have certainly been accused of elevating themselves to the high priesthood through cheating and bribery. Judah did not refuse the spoils of his campaigns (even if he did indeed give a fraction to charity; 2 Macc 8:28).

**They will mention the great name but neither truly nor rightly. They will defile the holy of holies with the impure corruption of their contamination.**

“Mentioning the great name” could refer to false oaths (e.g., Alcimus in 1 Macc 7:15), or to presiding illegitimately as high priest, going along with the following sentence. The sources are mixed on whether Judah ever claimed the high priesthood for himself in any explicit way. It seems likely that he did, not just because Josephus says so (*Antiquities* 12.414), but because the accounts in 1-2 Maccabees seem so implausible. He might at least have been accused of defiling the holy of holies even if he made only modest claims as a “proxy” high priest after “purifying” the temple and during those many years when Alcimus was not in Jerusalem or there is no high priest recorded at all. It seems more likely that the consequences of Judah’s tenuous claim were so deleterious as to be written out of the Maccabean account.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Other scholars: Berger identifies this verse with the Hasmonean high priesthood following 153 BCE. “Bezieht man mit Hengel Jub XXIII 21 auf das Versagen der Makkabäer, so kann sehr wohl die Errichtung des hasmonäischen Hohenpriestertums ab 153 v. Chr. mit im Blick stehen.” Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 300. My translation, “If, with Hengel, Jubilees 23:21 refers to the failure of the Maccabees, then very probably the establishment of the Hasmonean high priesthood starting from 153 BCE can also stand in view.”

Jubilees 30:15 could support an argument that the defilement of the holy of holies pertains not (or not only) to direct contact (such as an illegitimate high priest), but to the consequences of exogamy and impurity throughout the nation. Although there is clearly a connection between Jubilees 23:13, 21-22 and 30:15, the two types of sin need not be mutually exclusive. Most likely the author attributes the disastrous Jewish civil war both to exogamy and impurity among the broad causes, and also to murder and illegitimate ambition to the high priesthood among the more immediate causes.

**23:22 There will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation. He will deliver them to the sword, judgment, captivity, plundering, and devouring. 23:23 He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old or young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. They will cause chaos in Israel and sin against Jacob. Much blood will be shed on the earth, and there will be no one who gathers up (corpses) or who buries (them).**

Although 1 Maccabees does not portray the Seleucid armies as punishment from the Lord, Jubilees offers here a perfectly Deuteronomistic explanation of persecution by foreign nations as punishment for internal sin. (2 Macc holds that the sin of Israel allowed the temple to be desecrated, but still blames Antiochus.) Two superlative examples of destruction at the hand of foreign armies stand out. Unfortunately 1 and 2 Maccabees leave confusion in the details of the chronology, but it certainly happened that Antiochus attacked Jerusalem and imposed harsh persecution on its inhabitants (probably as a series of incidents; 1 Macc 1:20ff; 2 Macc 5:11; 6:1; see also Daniel 11:25, 29). Later on, in 160 BCE, Bacchides invaded, causing such destruction as to inspire a strong superlative even by the standards of 1 Maccabees,

There had not been such great distress in Israel since the time prophets ceased to appear among the people. (1 Macc 9:27)

Both incidents, as well as the preserved records indicate, would qualify for such a harsh description. Another criterion that fits both possibilities is the “Deuteronomistic” perspective that the invasion results from Jewish sin. Although 1 Maccabees portrays the persecutions by Antiochus as utterly unprovoked, Josephus and 2 Maccabees (in different ways) portray Antiochus as reacting to Jewish civil war and/or conspiracy. As for the later possibility, even 1 Maccabees does not manage to avoid the impression that the invasion is the result of civil strife over competing claims to the high priesthood (1 Macc 7:5).

One detail does, however, suggest the more recent foreign invasion in 160 BCE. Although the image of unburied bodies is not unique, Jubilees here echoes Psalm 79.

שָׁפְכוּ דָמָם | בְּמַיִם סְבִיבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם וְאֵין קוֹבֵר:

They shed their blood like water around Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them. (Psalm 79:1)

On one hand, Psalm 79 could just be a generic way of describing a massacre. On the other hand, I am aware of only one other instance in which the Psalm is applied to a historical event, and that is the massacre of the pietist scribes in 1 Maccabees 7:16-17.

But [Alcimus] arrested sixty of them and killed them in one day, according to the text of Scripture: The flesh of your saints they have strewn, and their blood they have shed round about Jerusalem, and there was no one to bury them. (1 Macc 7:16-17)

The connection between 1 Maccabees 7 and Psalm 79 is further supported by the previous two verses, first in that the Seleucid-backed Alcimus could have been associated with gentile defilement of the sanctuary, and second in that the victims of the massacre are called pietists (חסידים). Making Jerusalem into ruins, besides the general neglect of the sanctuary, was later a particular part of Alcimus’ legacy in that he began to tear down



the wall of the inner court (1 Maccabees 9:54; see below for further reason to believe the composition of Jubilees postdates the death of Alcimus).

מִזְמוֹר לְאַסָּף  
אֱלֹהִים בָּאוּ גוֹיִם | בְּנַחֲלָתְךָ טָמְאוּ אֶת־הַיֵּכָל קִדְשְׁךָ שָׁמוּ אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם לְעֵיִים:  
נִתְּנוּ אֶת־נַבְלָת עַבְדֶּיךָ מֵאֵכָל לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם בְּשָׂר חֲסִידֶיךָ לְחִיתוֹ-אַרְצָךְ:

A psalm of Asaph  
O God, the nations have entered your domain,  
defiled your holy temple, and made Jerusalem into ruins.

They have left the bodies of your servants as food for the birds of the sky,  
the flesh your pious ones to the beasts of the earth. (Psalm 79:1-2)

It seems plausible that a particular event, whether it was uniquely a massacre or not, came to be identified with Psalm 79 and was described as such in two unrelated documents, Jubilees and 1 Maccabees. If the author of Jubilees identified as a pietist, as has long been held,<sup>145</sup> it seems all the more plausible that such a recent event would have been mentioned. Nothing can be called certain based on so vague an allusion, but if there was a “Psalm 79 massacre,” and the chronology of 1 Maccabees is intact, it can be dated to 160 BCE.

**23:24 At that time they will cry out and call and pray to be rescued from the power of the sinful nations, but there will be no one who rescues (them). 23:25 The children’s heads will turn white with gray hair. A child who is three weeks of age will look old like one whose years are 100, and their condition will be destroyed through distress and pain.**

The absence of one capable of rescuing might suggest a judgment on the ability of Judah Maccabee to create more security than conflict. If it is a general reference, it would be difficult to date since Judah was frequently on the run himself, achieving vengeance but

---

<sup>145</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 251 n. 79.

not protection. If it is a specific reference, then it could match Judah's failure to support the pietist scribes as they were massacred (1 Macc 7:10-16).<sup>146</sup>

**23:26 In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way. 23:27 The days will begin to become numerous and increase, and mankind as well—generation by generation and day by day until their lifetimes approach 1000 years and to more years than the number of days (had been). ... They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully.**

The gradual restoration described here fits best with the period of peace starting in 159 BCE, but two other possibilities warrant consideration. First, one might think that the entire idea of any improvement is merely wishful thinking. The significance of the gradual restoration will figure prominently in the chapter on the temporal axis, but we can point out in a preliminary way that the claim here that the restoration has already begun is very historically plausible, unlike the fantastic restorations typical of historical apocalypses. To the extent that the author of Jubilees has students, verse 26 is certainly realized. The promise of things gradually getting better would have been tenable for at least one period (following 159 BCE). Just because the hopes for restoration are typically unrealized in apocalypses does not mean they are unrealized here. In fact, it seems likely that the author is not simply promising an unreal future but taking credit for a real but

---

<sup>146</sup> In general, we do not have good reason to believe the Book of Daniel as we know it directly influenced the Book of Jubilees. The name Daniel appears in Jubilees 4:20 for Enoch's father-in-law, with no distinctive connection to the Book of Daniel. The name can also be found in Ezekiel and Ugaritic myth. William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1957), 347 n.16. However, two distant echoes may appear here. We will consider later the possible (inverse) parallel between the whitened children here and the whitened *maskilim* of Daniel 11:35 (also 12:10). Unfortunately, a parallel between two vague references is itself little help, but one might find a resemblance between "there will be no one who rescues" here, and the previous verse in Daniel, "they will receive little help." The context of the origin of a pious group fits also. At this point in the discussion, the possibility that Jubilees here refers (ironically) to the origins of a (competing) group known as *maskilim*, can bear no weight for the purposes of dating Jubilees.

reasonably good present. In this view, it was not the multiple calls to arms of the preceding civil wars that brought peace, but non-violent Torah study with the proper teacher. If it is true that the author condemns civil war and promotes non-violent Torah study as the means to bring about salvation, then the second alternative possibility is easily dismissed. According to the second possibility, the beginning of the restoration here is realized in the early victories of the Maccabees. Although Judah's followers might have imagined that a golden age was dawning as a result of their piety through their military campaigns, no military component to "seeking out the laws" is implied in Jubilees. Rather, as the next verse indicates, humans have no role in driving out their enemies (Jubilees 23:30). The gradual and peaceful restoration of longevity in Jubilees simply does not match the tenuous and violent victories of Judah.

Thus we come to what I think *is* the most plausible historical context for the non-violent, gradual return to better days in Jubilees 23. In 159 BCE Alcimus died of natural causes and Bacchides abandoned the occupation (1 Macc 9:56-67). Although we would certainly like to know more about religious and civil authorities in Jerusalem between 159 and 152 BCE, the reports of peace in 1 Maccabees 9:57 and 73 are supported by the likelihood that if dramatic conflict was taking place then something would have been preserved of it. 1 Maccabees 9:58-72 does record a conspiracy against Jonathan in 157 BCE, but it seems not to have led to a widespread conflict. The author's specific claim that lifespan will gradually lengthen was hardly verifiable, but the diminishment of violent deaths would be a promising start. If the author of Jubilees could not have ignored the clash of 157, then a date between 159 and 157 seems likely, although any time between 159 and 152 fits well enough with the evidence. Among the other reasons for believing that the investiture and militarization of Jonathan in 152 BCE (1 Macc 10:21) is not

reflected in Jubilees,<sup>147</sup> we can add that this and the ensuing events would have conflicted with Jubilees' image of non-violent Torah piety gradually spreading through Israel.<sup>148</sup>

**23:30 [God] will expel his enemies. The righteous ... will see all their punishments and curses on their enemies.**

It is very possible that no actual historical connection should be sought for this part of the description of the restoration. However, two historical events might have inspired the notion that this process was beginning. The first possibility would again require us to assume that when God expels God's enemies God is doing so through human armies. Based on this assumption, the expulsion of enemies could refer to any of the victories attributed to Judah Maccabee, particularly the defeats of Nicanor (1 Macc 7:26-50; 2 Macc 8:35; 15:28). However, reading the text carefully but contrary to what one might expect by extrapolating from other texts, Jubilees does not indicate that human armies function as proxies for divine victory. Rather, the bloodless withdrawal of Bacchides in 159 BCE fits uniquely well with the image of invisible forces expelling a gentile tyrant (1 Macc 9:57). This would also fit well with the idea that God imposed the punishment of painful and untimely death on Alcimus, in light of the fact that the central curses and punishments of Jubilees 23 are illness and mortality. Although 1 Maccabees attributed the death of Alcimus and retreat of Bacchides to the impiety of Alcimus, the author of Jubilees could certainly have seized on this event in support of the claim that

---

<sup>147</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 249-252. In particular, the author's view of the Jerusalem high priesthood is very favorable except for the interruption in the civil war years (Jubilees 31:13-17; 45:16; 49:21; 23:21). It is not plausible that the author of Jubilees would have appreciated the high priesthood of Jonathan, suggesting that the author's high opinion of the office went unchallenged by the stabilization of the Hasmonean high priesthood.

<sup>148</sup> Other scholars: Testuz makes a similar observation but views the last quarter of the second century as the best candidate for a time of peace and prosperity. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 34.

non-violent piety will bring about the age of restoration. If “the righteous” here correspond at all to the pietist scribes of 1 Macc 7:12-13, Alcimus would certainly be chief among their enemies. The basic pattern of painful but natural death would also fit with the death of Antiochus Epiphanes in 164 BCE (1 Macc 6:16).

In conclusion, it is possible to align the basic structure of civil war, foreign occupation, and signs of restoration to the beginning or end of the 160s BCE. Either possibility fits well enough with the other evidence available. (Even if chapters 34 and 37 were influenced by later events, 23 could have been written earlier by the same author or based on earlier experiences.) The broader argument of this dissertation does not require specificity within more than a few decades. That said, it does seem that the later set of identifications is more likely. The details of the famine and the “Psalm 79 massacre” are suggestive, though not conclusive. The critical retrospective on the Jewish civil war is more persuasive. Although the earlier dating is initially attractive, this initial attraction is superficial. First, the conflict between Judah and Alcimus in 161 BCE may pale, in our perspective, in comparison to the conflict between Jason and Menelaus, but a more recent massacre could have seemed more important to the ancient author. Second, given that most of our sources portray Judah Maccabee positively as fighting primarily against foreign aggression, it may be difficult to read Jubilees as critical of Judah Maccabee and the civil bloodshed in which he participated. If we look past both of these distractions, and look for a time when the claim of a non-violent, gradual restoration could be sustained, then the years following 159 BCE become more attractive.

As if often the case with dating ancient texts, we may not have the clear evidence to cast away all doubt, but there is one best explanation of all the evidence available. A number of points suggest, and all the evidence fits with, the probability that the Book of Jubilees achieved its final form in the 150s BCE. The frustration in finding any one clear indicator of date is offset by the quantity of cumulative indicators from so large a work, the coherence of the composition, and the remarkable precision with which it has been preserved in translation. In a field accustomed to building tenuously on the best indicators available, the historical context of Jubilees is relatively certain. Other possibilities may be worth reconsidering as new evidence becomes available, but in the meantime we can be reasonably confident with reading Jubilees in the historical context of the 150s BCE.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE VIEW OF REVELATION

The genre “apocalypse” typically authorizes new revelation. Jubilees, however, uses the genre to authorize revelation that is already authoritative. Both of these statements require significant qualification, but a difference holds between new and derivative. The Jewish apocalypses typically resonate with authoritative literature or use it as a springboard, but neither the contents nor the authority derive primarily from the interpretation of received literature. Jubilees exercises great creativity, but fundamentally derives its authority from authoritative materials. Any interpretation needs to be authorized in some way, and perhaps to some degree the importance of received scripture needed to be re-authorized. The use of the genre “apocalypse” to authorize an interpretation closely derived from received scripture, however, goes beyond overkill and beyond atypical. The genre “apocalypse” creates reader expectations that something new is going to be revealed, but Jubilees presents something derivative. The contrast between authorizing new revelation and over-authorizing derivative interpretation, with the appropriate qualifications, occupies the first section of this chapter.

The second section will turn to what is said about revelation. Typically in the apocalypses, revelation is mysterious or coded, and only with recourse to special wisdom or additional revelation can the true meaning, and consequently the true path to

righteousness and divine favor, be understood. In Jubilees, however, revelation is fool-proof. Jubilees does not convey meaning in codes, it does not interpret Genesis as if a code or allegory, and it downplays codes and enigmas in Genesis itself. Wisdom is not an important category in the view of revelation; it is neither a prerequisite for righteousness nor a consequence of the study of revelation. One must study the law, but the meanings are not secret, mysterious, or particularly hidden. Covenantal fidelity, with its requirements and rewards, is publicly revealed to all Israel in the received scriptures, regardless of intelligence.

One might describe the basic observation of the first section as the collision of “apocalypse” and “rewritten bible” in Jubilees.<sup>1</sup> One might describe the basic observation of the second section as the separation of “apocalypse” from “wisdom” in Jubilees. I wish to suggest, however, that these are not superficial variations on the use of the genre “apocalypse,” but the ironic use of the genre to subvert the worldview typically conveyed by the genre at the time of Jubilees. An apocalypse is fundamentally an uncovering and implicitly an uncovering of something new and mysterious. We should recognize irony in the uncovering of narratives and laws that are fundamentally familiar.

#### 4.1. The use and view of received authority

The issue of this section is particularly subtle. Although I argue that Jubilees differs from contemporary apocalypses in that it is primarily authorized by its

---

<sup>1</sup> For a recent review of the benefits and dangers in the term “rewritten bible,” see Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196. Bernstein concludes that, properly used, the category has not outlived its usefulness.



dependence on the received scriptures of Israel, I acknowledge gray areas on both sides of the distinction. Contemporary apocalypses do gain authority in their resonances with received authority. They sound like something God, a wisdom hero, or a prophet would say, even though one could not derive the content of what is said from any prior source. On the other side, Jubilees, like any interpretive work, needed to authorize itself. If we approach Jubilees from the perspective of methods of authorizing interpretations we find a difference of degree, since all interpretations use some such methods.<sup>2</sup> If we approach Jubilees from the perspective of reader expectations based on the genre apocalypse, however, we find a stark division between new and derived revelation.<sup>3</sup> Jubilees falls fundamentally on the “derived” side of the spectrum, and contemporary apocalypses fundamentally on the “new” side.

In the broad strokes the case is clear. Often enough, there is no mistaking the difference between mysteries revealed and public traditions rewritten. In some specific instances—Jubilees at its most creative and the Animal Apocalypse at its most derivative—finer analysis is required. Even here, where the points on the spectrum are closest, a distinction can be made. The difference is not apparent if we only check whether derivative and novel points are present, whether familiar authority and re-contextualization take place, and whether the simple sense is challenged. The difference comes down to the end to which received traditions are used. The Animal Apocalypse

---

<sup>2</sup> Hindy Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379.

<sup>3</sup> This distinction was suggested by George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion,” in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: an Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck, *JSJSup* 80 (Boston, MA: Brill, 2003; reprint, first published in *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers* 33, edited by Eugene H. Lovering, 715-732. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 276-277.

uses scripture, and inherently interprets scripture, but does not review history to the end of interpreting scripture. The review of history builds to the present moment (Animal Apocalypse 90:6), at which point scriptural interpretation falls away and institutions such as the priesthood and temple are discussed only as being radically reformed. Daniel 9 is another interesting case, but the base text is not so much interpreted as overlaid with a new revelation that supersedes the original revelation.<sup>4</sup>

The fact that Jubilees has clear concerns based on contemporary context does not negate the basic point that Jubilees is primarily engaged in interpreting scripture. The question is not whether Jubilees is “pure” exegesis, but whether scripture ceases to be the concern. Sometimes Jubilees solves problems within a passage, sometimes reconciles two passages, and sometimes reconciles scripture with theological presuppositions, but scripture is always on the table. In Jubilees 23, for example, Jubilees departs from rewriting Genesis-Exodus, but is still reacting to an interpretation of Third Isaiah with an interpretation of Deuteronomy 28, etc., as an explanation of current events. We cannot be sure how much of the Levi material in Jubilees is received, but it is clear that the Genesis account of Levi the patriarch is filled out on the basis of other material about the priests and Levites. In some cases, Jubilees is not interpreting Genesis so much as the other texts that give awkward accounts of the origins of priestly and Levitical privilege.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> It is widely observed that apocalypses resonate with received traditions, but are not primarily interpretations. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 390-391, 429. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 40.

<sup>5</sup> The Levi material in Jubilees is complicated because we cannot be sure what traditions were received by Jubilees, but even if we were to assume that most of the expansions were “new” in Jubilees, it would still be creativity toward the end of biblical interpretation. It is not necessarily wrong to read Jubilees’ interest in the Levites and the temple as indicative of social location, but the field of play is still scripture. Jubilees infuses the Genesis accounts of Levi the patriarch with other scriptural accounts of Levites and priests. Jubilees shifts the etiology of the priesthood from Moses (who had a certain conflict of interests) and the fallout of the Golden Calf, to merit and heavenly design long before. Historical-critical

Novelty is a spectrum, not a binary characteristic, and it is not always easy to measure. We should underestimate neither the extent to which apocalypses can be derivative, nor the extent to which Jubilees can be creative. Even at the points where Jubilees and the apocalypses most resemble each other, a line can be drawn. Novelty and derivation can take many forms, but at the threshold, the reader expectation of novelty from an apocalypse is satisfied when the authority of the revelatory framework addresses problems beyond mortal capability. The interpretation of scripture by weaving together received texts and traditions, however, was already familiar in the human domain.

Jubilees raises, but does not meet, the expectation of previously inaccessible contents. The irony comes in the fact that Jubilees claims to be, or at least leads the reader to expect it to be, something other than what it turns out to be. The typical apocalypse claims to be new and is new. It claims to be an independent revelation and it is an independent revelation. Jubilees, however, frames itself as if new but is in fact derived. Jubilees claims to be an independent revelation but could just as easily have been “rewritten scripture” without the genre “apocalypse.”

Before exploring the novelty, and limits of novelty, of the Enochic apocalypses, the Danielic apocalypses, and then Jubilees, we should clarify the difference between using a received authority and embracing its worldview. We must understand “received” broadly, without illusions of canon, dogma, or denomination.<sup>6</sup> Reception was not all or

---

scholars have interpreted the problems of the origins of the priests and Levites as a long history of struggle between priestly groups (see chapter 5, note 93). Jubilees has a different solution, but is interpreting the same sources, along with other traditions only partially known to us.

<sup>6</sup> A critical understanding of reception and authority of scriptures and scriptural traditions in the second century BCE is an ongoing project. See VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature,” 382-402. James C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls ” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91-109. Eugene Ulrich, “The Notion and Definition of Canon,” in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A.

none. There was no list that established one work as fixed and supremely authoritative, and another work as unusable. We cannot assume that Jubilees only acknowledges texts with which it agrees. Jubilees could not deny the fact that Third Isaiah and the Book of the Watchers, for example, were part of the tradition, but Jubilees could re-shape the received tradition according to its own worldview. Although we will find that Jubilees embraces the worldview of Deuteronomy more consistently than that of Third Isaiah or the Book of the Watchers, that has no bearing on defining which traditions were received and bore some familiar authority. For practical reasons, we will focus on Jewish traditions known to us in writing, but this is not to deny that received traditions could also be oral or non-Jewish in origin.<sup>7</sup>

---

Sanders (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 21-35. Eugene Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness," *DSD* 10, no. 1 (2003): 3-25. Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 5-20. John Barton, "The Significance of a Fixed Canon of the Hebrew Bible," in *Hebrew Bible Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 67-83. The social implications of a claim to higher revelation are largely bracketed in the present work, but are addressed in John J. Collins, "Ethos and Identity in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *Ethos und Identität: Einheit und Vielfalt des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, ed. Matthias Konradt and Ulrike Steinert, Studien zu Judentum und Christentum (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2002), 51-65.

<sup>7</sup> The use and view of "foreign" traditions is too thorny an issue to be profitably discussed in the present work, but it does seem promising—if one could move from modern to ancient perceptions of "foreignness" in literature and wisdom—that the apocalyptic worldview suggests that revealed wisdom can be found among all nations, whereas Jubilees holds that the only legitimate revelation is preserved by the Levites in Jerusalem (Jubilees 45:16, "He gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today.").

For influences on the apocalypses from the broader cultural context see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 36-37. Jonathan Z. Smith, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic," in *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity: Essays in Conversation with Geo Widengren*, ed. Birger Albert Pearson, Series on Formative Contemporary Thinkers 1 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 131-156. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 189. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things," 438. Hans D. Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalyptic," *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969): 138. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*. David Winston Suter, "Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 'Enoch' 6-16," *Henoch* 25, no. 2 (2003): 172.

#### 4.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses

I wish to avoid the exaggeration that the Enochic apocalypses are discontinuous with or in opposition to Jewish traditions including the Mosaic Pentateuch.<sup>8</sup> In the Enochic apocalypses the genre functions to authorize revelation that echoes with the familiar, but is not derivative of previous revelation. The Enochic apocalypses assume and build on previous Enochic apocalypses, as well as other received traditions, but they do not rewrite or sustain a continuous exposition of received authorities. Simply put, the basic method often labeled “rewritten bible” and described by Alexander as centripetal interpretation,<sup>9</sup> does not describe the Enochic apocalypses.

##### 4.1.1.1. The use of Enochic traditions

Without dwelling on the complexities of the earliest origins of Enochic traditions, there can be no doubt that by the time of Jubilees a set of traditions about Enoch as a

---

<sup>8</sup> The view of Moses and the Torah in *1 Enoch* is still debated. Among works emphasizing a positive connection are E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). Lars Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5*, CB.NT 12 (Lund: Gleerup, 1979). An oppositional relationship, especially prior to the Maccabean revolt, is developed in Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, trans. William J. Short, JSPSup 20 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990). Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*. Andreas Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte 8 (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000). Andreas Bedenbender, “The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 65-79. Nickelsburg tends to fall on the side of negative views, but is more sensitive to the extent to which the Torah influences *1 Enoch* (see note 13). The idea of an Enochic Pentateuch goes back to G. H. Dix, “The Enochic Pentateuch,” *JTS* 27 (1925-1926): 29-42. The notion was advanced by Milik and Black, *The Books of Enoch*. It was first refuted by Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51-65.

<sup>9</sup> Centrifugal expansions “take as their starting-point a single episode of the Bible, or a very short passage, and expand it almost beyond recognition.... Rewritten Bible texts are centripetal: they come back to the Bible again and again.” Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 117.

recipient of revelation was received and could be used to help authorize further revelation. One can rightly question whether editorial hands might be responsible for certain framework passages that situate individual revelations in the life of Enoch. Nevertheless, the Enochic apocalypses near the time of Jubilees inextricably depend on the figure of Enoch and allude to the content of previous apocalypses, even if strict consistency is not required. The idea of Enochic revelation is received and Enochic apocalypses can draw on the authority of the figure of Enoch, but the point here is that the content of each apocalypse brings a new revelation. One can certainly speak of redactors reconciling and summarizing, but the corpus builds by accretion of new revelation much more than interpretation of former revelation.

The growth by accretion can be seen already in the combination of the Shemihazah and Asael strands in the Book of the Watchers.<sup>10</sup> Closer to the time of Jubilees, one can see how the narrative framework of the life of Enoch was put to use by the Apocalypse of Weeks. Whether one counts the beginning as 93:1 or 93:3, the Apocalypse of Weeks draws on the experience and revelation of Enoch in particular, in addition to the appropriated language of “Enoch took up his discourse and said...” (Apocalypse of Weeks 93:1, 3). The basic content of the revelation, particularly as it approaches the time of the audience, resonates with but is not derived from former revelation.

---

<sup>10</sup> Only in a loose sense could the Book of the Watchers 20-36 be called an interpretive expansion of BW 17-19. Michael A. Knibb, “The Book of Enoch in the Light of the Qumran Wisdom Literature,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 168 (Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003), 210.

The Animal Apocalypse demonstrates the limits of derived authority, but still fits the basic pattern of the genre authorizing non-derived revelation. The Animal Apocalypse 86:1—89:1 builds on the Book of the Watchers, among other sources, in the form of summary, not exposition.<sup>11</sup> The Animal Apocalypse goes on to develop ideas implicit in the Book of the Watchers about the nature of evil and the *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology of judgment. The Animal Apocalypse also shares an idea of division of history comparable to the Apocalypse of Weeks, uses the figure of Enoch, and adopts the apocalyptic worldview in general.<sup>12</sup> As much as these resonances and continuities may authorize the Animal Apocalypse, the basic ideas are not derivative. The behavior of the seventy shepherds is consistent with the behavior of angels in the Book of the Watchers, but the explanation of post-exilic history as the commissioning of seventy angels to rule Israel is new (see next for the use of Ezekiel 34). It is not surprising that the historical details of the “present” are not derived from former traditions, but it is striking that the imagined restoration has only thematic similarities with other visions of future restoration. Whereas the Animal Apocalypse uses *early* history as an opportunity to connect with familiar traditions, the details of the restoration do not even attempt consistency with previous apocalypses. This is not to say the genre “apocalypse” is fundamentally opposed to reconciling received revelations of the future, only that a reader at the time of Jubilees would expect an apocalypse to use derived elements as a springboard for thoroughly new revelation.

---

<sup>11</sup> See further, Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 359-360.

<sup>12</sup> Nickelsburg places greater emphasis on the dependence of the Animal Vision on the Apocalypse of Weeks, suggesting that the former may be a “massive elaboration” of the later. The common intellectual foundation is clear enough, but evidence of literary dependence is lacking and it would be difficult to argue that the Animal Apocalypse claims or acknowledges such dependence. *Ibid.*, 360.

#### 4.1.1.2. The use of non-Enochic Jewish traditions

The use, and the limits of use, of received scriptures in the Enochic apocalypses have already been thoroughly analyzed by Nickelsburg and others. We need only review some basic points here, since the present argument does not depend on the more controversial points about the understanding of Mosaic authority. We will give more attention to the Animal Apocalypse, which again demonstrates the greatest extent of derivation from received authority of any contemporary apocalypse, yet still differs substantially from the rewriting found in Jubilees.

Before coming to specific examples we might consider some general assessments.<sup>13</sup> The extent to which the Enochic apocalypses resonate with and presume received scripture is not lost on Nickelsburg,

Thus *1 Enoch* represents a remarkable *tour de force* in the religion of Israel. The authors speak in the language and forms of accepted authoritative Scripture (Torah and Prophets) with all its resonances. However, the explicit authority of the text lies not in these real sources, but in its claim to direct revelation received long before Moses or the prophets lived and spoke.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 57-61. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, ed. Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 333-354. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumran Fragments," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick, and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 91-107. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?," in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, ed. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, Brown Judaic Studies 320 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123-132. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom and its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah," in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 81-94. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*. Lars Hartman, "An Early Example of Jewish Exegesis: *1 Enoch* 10:16—11:2," *Neotestamentica* 17 (1983): 16-27.

<sup>14</sup> Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," 346.



In the same article Nickelsburg goes on to emphasize the novelty of the claims of revelation.

The Enochic authors, however, claim *fresh* revelation. They do not quote the Hebrew Scriptures and interpret or rewrite those Scriptures in their own terms. Instead they cut themselves loose from the received texts and create new ones.<sup>15</sup>

Although there are many points where the relationship between a received tradition and its use in an Enochic apocalypse can be disputed, we need to step back to see the basic point that concerns us here. For example, if one turns to pages 338-339 in Nickelsburg's aforementioned seminal article on the subject, the language is consistently on the level of, "scriptural nuances... parallels... biblical vocabulary... reminiscent of... language imitating... shaped by biblical accounts."<sup>16</sup> We need not deny the accuracy or the significance of these allusions; we need only observe that the relationship between Jubilees and its sources is radically more direct.

Although a number of classic examples of allusions dominate the discussion of the relationship between Enochic and Mosaic discourse, most of these allusions, whatever the tone or nature of their use, are not the sustained derivative discussions which Alexander calls centripetal. Thus, the dependence on the oracle form, as in Numbers 22, and the blessing in Deuteronomy 33 (BW 1) do not really demonstrate the limit of derivation from received authorities in apocalypses contemporary to Jubilees. The use of Genesis 5-6 as a springboard is obvious, and Ezekiel 1-2 (BW 14) and Isaiah

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 348-349. I would emphasize a point that Nickelsburg also mentions, that the revelatory setting well before the time of Moses partially accounts for the lack of explicit citation of Mosaic discourse. The issue here is not the lack of direct citation, but the lack of substantial continuity between the "sources" and the resonances. Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," 342.

<sup>16</sup> Nickelsburg, "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture," 338-339.

65-66<sup>17</sup> cannot go unmentioned. In my opinion the most important case for establishing the limit of the extent to which we can say that apocalypses at the time of Jubilees present non-derivative revelation is the Animal Apocalypse, particularly with respect to Ezekiel 34.

Among the many sources that can be identified behind the Animal Apocalypse, none exerts an influence that is as sustained in theme and imagery as Ezekiel 34. Biblical history from Genesis through Kings is glossed. The dependence on Ezekiel 34 (presumably with some help from Zechariah) is more than a gloss. The themes and imagery may be traditional, but Ezekiel 34 offers a substantial concentration of parallels.<sup>18</sup> The works share the imagery of owner/lord, shepherd (adapted), good sheep, bad sheep, and beasts, and the themes of abuse of authority, dispersion, ingathering, divine judgment, and restoration, including a new individual figure.

The resonances of Ezekiel 34 in the Animal Apocalypse certainly convey a degree of authority, simply in the fact of sounding familiar. However, two factors moderate the extent to which we can say the Animal Apocalypse derives authority from Ezekiel: first, and more superficially, the Animal Apocalypse makes no such claim; second, the Animal Apocalypse makes no effort to solve problems within Ezekiel, nor does it justify or explain the transitions from “text” to “interpretation”. The first point, that the Animal Apocalypse does not claim authority from Ezekiel, goes beyond the fact that the figure of Ezekiel is not referred to by name or allusion. The passage that treats Ezekiel’s time not

---

<sup>17</sup> See Ibid., 336.

<sup>18</sup> Tiller places more emphasis on the extent to which the imagery and themes are traditional, whereas Nickelsburg places more emphasis on the concentration of parallels with Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 59. Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 391.

only fails to allude to this particular prophet, it seems to suggest that the “normal” pattern of prophets calling the sheep back to the right way has already been displaced by the commissioning of seventy shepherds (Animal Apocalypse 89:59-72). The Animal Apocalypse says nothing to suggest a textual relationship, identify the revelatory settings, or account for the similarities as a common source.<sup>19</sup> It is one thing for modern scholars to recognize the direct or indirect influence of Ezekiel 34, but there is no literary acknowledgement of such a dependence. Resonances may be inherently authorizing, but this resonance is not an explicit or primary source of authority for the Animal Apocalypse.

The second point is more substantial. The Animal Apocalypse may be influenced by Ezekiel 34, and interpret it in a general sense, but it does not solve problems within Ezekiel 34, nor does it solve the problems that would follow from close comparison of the two “revelations”. To extend the metaphor of the “springboard,” the Animal Apocalypse bounces on Ezekiel 34 a few more times than the typical allusion in an apocalypse, but still ends up leaping off in a new direction. It does not so much explicate the subtleties of the base text as overlay it with a new layer of revelation. Thus, the Animal Apocalypse does not take up all the images of Ezekiel 34, such as the polluted water (Ezekiel 34:18-19). It does not justify or explain the innovation that the shepherds are neither Jewish nor human. There is no attempt to derive or reconcile the claim that the shepherds are divinely appointed, and will not be judged until an appointed time. The

---

<sup>19</sup> Contrast this with Jubilees, which claims a relationship with the “first law” (Jubilees 6:22), identifies the revelatory setting as Sinai and Exodus 24 in particular, and uses the heavenly tablets to assert and explain the unity of all valid revelation.

Animal Apocalypse does not claim to interpret Ezekiel 34, nor does it actually do so in the narrow sense of explicating a text.

Individual aspects of the Animal Apocalypse are derivative, but the purpose and conclusion of the work as a whole wanders in a new direction, far from the interpretation of received authority. The genre “apocalypse” authorizes the claim that a fiery abyss will open up and burn the bones of the current temple leadership (90:26-27), not the claim that David ruled Israel after the death of Saul (89:48).

The Animal Apocalypse represents the limit, not the average, of what we can imagine an informed reader would expect from an apocalypse with respect to derivation of authority and contents of revelation. The Danielic apocalypses (especially Daniel 9) bring us to a further set of considerations, but ultimately do not surpass the Animal Apocalypse on the spectrum from new to derived authority.

#### 4.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses

The use of received authorities in the Danielic apocalypses, as in the previous sub-section on the Enochic apocalypses, can be separated into the use of Danielic traditions and the use of other received traditions. The dominant (but not only) point for this sub-section will be the use of Jeremiah in Daniel 9, which is unique among the early apocalypses in explicitly citing a source.<sup>20</sup> In order to understand the use of Jeremiah we must first consider the use in the apocalypses of traditions found in the court tales. The apocalypses develop the idea found in the court tales of multiple stages of revelation.

---

<sup>20</sup> John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 359.

Daniel 9 presents Jeremiah as a stage of revelation that is legitimate but incomplete.

Daniel acknowledges the authority of Jeremiah but does not derive its own authority from Jeremiah. The apocalypse is an independent instance of revelation that relates to but does not derive from a former instance of revelation.

#### 4.1.2.1. The use of Danielic traditions

The Danielic apocalypses build on received traditions about Daniel and so appropriate, to an extent, the authority of the Daniel traditions. We should not underestimate the continuities in the Danielic traditions and the extent to which the apocalypses would have sounded familiar and authoritative. These factors moderate, but do not negate, the point that the predominant authorization is the assertion of revelation in the manner of the genre “apocalypse”. We will take as a point of departure that the court tales in Daniel 3-6 predate and influence the formation of the Danielic apocalypses. Daniel 2 should be treated separately. Since it reflects so many features of the Danielic apocalypses (other than genre), we cannot be as confident where it falls amid the formation of apocalypses around traditions framed as court tales.<sup>21</sup> We are here concerned only with identifying the continuities, not explaining the mechanisms of continuity.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, we are not concerned with explaining the origins of Danielic

---

<sup>21</sup> An exhaustive study would also be concerned with the Danielic traditions found outside the 12-chapter redaction.

<sup>22</sup> For example, are the apocalypses a linear development of a coherent tradition that also produced the court tales, or should we think of a looser connection? There do seem to be enough continuities that we can at least understand why the writers of the apocalypses would be drawn to develop their works in Danielic terms.

traditions, only the point at which apocalypses begin to make use of a received tradition about a wisdom-hero whose adventures included revealed interpretation. The later Danielic apocalypses (and redactions) also build on the authority of the earlier apocalypses. These continuities should be understood as part of the authorizing strategies of the apocalypses. In general, the continuities contribute a sense of familiarity and consistency. On a deeper level, one of the continuities, the idea of multiple stages of revelation, authorizes the underlying claim that revelation is ongoing and subject to amendment. The Danielic apocalypses not only exhibit but defend the principle of new revelation. Thus it is all the more discordant when a reader finds, in Jubilees, fundamentally derivative revelation in the framework of an apocalypse.

Even if one brackets Daniel 2, Daniel 4 in particular illustrates a significant number of continuities from the received Danielic traditions into the apocalypses. Here one finds an enhanced agency of angels (Daniel 4:10, 14, 32), as well as numerically auspicious chronology (4:22, 26).<sup>23</sup> One can find in Daniel 5:26-28 the idea of a declining sequence of kingdoms, which becomes developed in Daniel 2 and 7, along with imminent doom (if not eschatology proper).<sup>24</sup> There are similarities in framework between Daniel 4 and 2, and Daniel 7 has even been called a “midrash” on Daniel 2, but Collins distinguishes influence from derivation, “It is a new vision, and the earlier chapter is only one of many influences on it.”<sup>25</sup> Collins also notes “echoes of

---

<sup>23</sup> It is worth distinguishing prediction and numerical auspiciousness from predestination.

<sup>24</sup> The decreasing monetary value of kings behind Daniel 5:25 is elaborated by Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 251.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 323, 173.

terminology” that provide continuity between Daniel 7 and the court tales.<sup>26</sup> Daniel 5:18-21 is exceptional in that it recapitulates a former court tale, but a more general narrative continuity appears in several places in the work as we have it.<sup>27</sup> These facts should caution us against any simplistic generalizations to the effect that apocalypses present purely new revelation without building on received traditions and gaining some authority from the continuity. Yet, on the spectrum from new to derived revelation and authority, Daniel never approaches the extent to which Jubilees derives the content and authority of revelation from received authorities.

Of all the ways in which the Danielic apocalypses build on Danielic traditions, none is more significant for this chapter than the idea of multiple stages of revelation. Indeed, the second section of this chapter will return to the same basic issue from the perspective of elitism of coded revelation. The idea of multiple stages of revelation can be found in the Danielic court tales and developed further in the apocalypses. To aid clarity upfront, I should mention the external but particularly direct formulation found in Peshar Habakkuk:

God told Habakkuk to write down the things that are going to come upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the period God did not make known to him. (1Q Peshar Habakkuk 7.1-2)

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 311. For more continuities and discontinuities between Daniel 1-6 and Daniel 7, see Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 294. Ideas such as punishment by burning also reappear (Daniel 3:11; 7:11).

<sup>27</sup> For example, Daniel 8:27 assumes the work of the king that Daniel was doing in the court tales. Daniel 8:1 refers explicitly to a former vision, and picks up (however loosely) the imagery of animals and horns. Daniel 9:21 refers to the *angelus interpretes* of a prior vision. Daniel 10:12 evokes Daniel 9 for an angel sent as soon as requested (however adapted). Even though the chronological sequence “resets” with the apocalypses, within each part a chronological sequence is presented.

As we shall soon see, Daniel 9 approaches Jeremiah similarly. Nickelsburg has described this idea as “secondary revelation” or “revealed interpretation”.<sup>28</sup> I prefer to speak of multiple stages of revelation, partially in anticipation of outlining three stages without implying secondary or tertiary value in the second and third stages. “Interpretation” strikes me as too loaded a term to describe the relationship between the stages, in as much as it may suggest a human activity of derivation.<sup>29</sup>

The idea of stages of revelation is already found, in some form, in the court tales. Daniel 2, 4, and 5 all include an initial stage of revelation which is divine in origin, legitimate, and meaningful even if the first stage is not sufficient to access that meaning.<sup>30</sup> Daniel 4 and 5 do not perfectly fit the emerging pattern at the second stage in that the interpretation is not (or at least not emphatically) a revelation in its own right. Daniel may appear to interpret the initial revelation from his own wisdom. Yet even here the ancient thinker could easily understand Daniel’s wisdom as revealed in a general sense. The divine nature of Daniel’s wisdom appears in Daniel 4:5, 15; 5:11, 14. The interpretation in Daniel 5:26-28 rings more of the miraculous than earthly wisdom.

---

<sup>28</sup> Nickelsburg, “The Nature and Function of Revelation,” 112.

<sup>29</sup> Armin Lange has studied the phenomenon of revealed interpretation in the broader context of the eastern Mediterranean in antiquity. Lange emphasizes continuity in the development of practices of re-interpretation. Armin Lange, “Interpretation als Offenbarung: Zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 168 (Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003), 17-33. Be that as it may, the end result is a distinctive development, as interpretation claims independent revelation as authority over connection to the original text. See further, Michael Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10-28.

<sup>30</sup> One issue that is not discussed in this chapter is the view of the availability of revelation and revealed wisdom to other nations. Whereas Jubilees claims that even the antediluvian revelations of the heavenly tablets are transmitted to and preserved by Israel alone, Daniel claims gentiles have access to preliminary revelation and are able to appreciate its explication.



Daniel 2 emphasizes that the second stage is a divine revelation in its own right. Nebuchadnezzar receives a revelation which turns out to be legitimate, but other than motivating him to find a reliable interpretation, the first stage is not sufficient for conveying meaning. The second stage, the interpretation, is itself revealed in Daniel 2:19. The independence of this revelation hardly establishes a dichotomy between revealed information and revealed wisdom. Daniel's prayer makes clear that God not only answers questions, but gives sages the wisdom to understand hidden things (2:21). Daniel 2 both illustrates a second stage of revelation that is fully independent of human reasoning, and also claims that the divine wisdom Daniel used in chapters 4 and 5 is itself a form of revelation. Although we might be quick to observe the difference between a revealed interpretation that comes in a night vision following a direct request to God, and an interpretation that comes from a wise person "on the spot," Daniel 2 seems to be asserting that they are both revelation. Thus, clearly one—and from an ancient perspective three—of the court tales exhibit two stages of revelation. The initial stage is legitimate but not complete by itself.

We should also consider a third stage. If Nebuchadnezzar receives a first stage "revelation" and Daniel a second stage "revealed interpretation," it still remains the case that Daniel does not always exactly understand even the interpretation. It remains for the audience to fulfill the third stage of understanding the historical meaning of the revelation. For example, Daniel may have understood that the mixing of clay and iron indicates a failed marriage (2:43), but it remains for the third stage to identify specifically the individuals in question.<sup>31</sup> More explicitly, Daniel does not understand in 12:8 what

---

<sup>31</sup> Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 170.

the enlightened will understand later in 12:10. The unsealing of the vision is part of the third stage (Daniel 12:4). It might be a stretch for moderns to think of the third stage as a revelation, rather than a realization, but we should not be too quick to dismiss the extent to which insight could be considered revealed wisdom. The point is neither that all stages are equal, nor that one is necessarily better than the other, but that revelation is spread out over stages and some degree of revelation is active at each stage.<sup>32</sup>

The idea of multiple stages of revelation underlies all the Danielic apocalypses to varying extents. The major shift is that Daniel's role becomes less active as the second stage revelation is taken over by an angelic figure. Even when the first and second stages are aspects of the same vision, there remains a striking division of vision and interpretation. The first and second stages are least clearly distinct in Daniel 10-12,<sup>33</sup> but in Daniel 12:8-10 the division between the second and third stage is explicit. Daniel 9 is the most interesting case, however, and brings us to the next point on the use of non-Danielic received authorities. The first stage of revelation is not Danielic at all, but the revelation received in the book of Jeremiah. While one should not push too far the comparison between Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Jeremiah's prophecy, in both cases the second stage of revelation does not explicate the first in mundane terms, but constitutes an independent revelation. The first stage is legitimate but not complete by itself.

---

<sup>32</sup> Consider this among many ways in which the reception of revelation was understood to continue transformed in the second temple period, as discussed by Hindy Najman, *Prophetic Ends: Concepts of the Revelatory in Late Ancient Judaism* (2008), forthcoming.

<sup>33</sup> Perhaps this apocalypse presumes the former visions as stage 1 and presents itself as an elaborate stage 2. Thus in Daniel 10:1 the *דָּבָר נִגְלָה* would be stage 1 and stage 2 would be *בִּינָה לֹא בִּמְרָאָה*.

To conclude this point, the continuities in the Danielic tradition are such that the Danielic apocalypses are not entirely new. They do derive contents and authority from received sources to a non-negligible degree. Yet, these continuities are never so substantial that any Danielic apocalypse can be called derivative or a rewriting of a former apocalypse or court tale. Furthermore, one of the continuities from the court tales to the apocalypses, the principle of multiple stages of revelation, is practically a manifesto for ongoing revelation and the possibility that received revelation can continue to be amended in unexpected ways.

#### 4.1.2.2. The use of non-Danielic Jewish traditions

The Danielic apocalypses in general contain resonances with received traditions not unlike those characteristic of the Enochic apocalypses.<sup>34</sup> Daniel 9 is an especially interesting case for the use of received authorities in the early apocalypses. Not only is there a citation of Jeremiah, but the explanation of suffering associated with Deuteronomy is cited, “as written in the law of Moses.” Again, to a certain extent, Daniel derives authority from sounding familiar and continuous with the received traditions of

---

<sup>34</sup> For example, the elevation of the little horn in Daniel 8:10 resonates with the hubris of the day star in Isaiah 14:12-15. The *angelus interpres* already appeared in Zechariah 1-6. The throne and related visions of Daniel 7 and 10-12 resonate with Ezekiel and perhaps the Book of the Watchers chapter 14. Daniel 7 is a classic example of elusive allusions to ancient mythic imagery. For further discussion, see Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1985), 482-495. It is important not to deny the basic level at which the Danielic apocalypses are continuous with received traditions. This continuity does not negate the contrast between the basically derivative authority of Jubilees and the basically novel authority of the Danielic apocalypses. Collins says of Daniel 7 what we may call typical of the early apocalypses, “Whoever composed Daniel 7 was a creative author, not merely a copyist of ancient sources. It should be no surprise that his contribution is a new entity, discontinuous in some respects with all its sources.” Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 281-282. The author of Jubilees is also creative, but much more continuous with the received authorities.

Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. Yet, the apocalypse of Daniel 9 does not derive its own authority directly from these sources. We should avoid the suggestion that Daniel 9 rejects the legitimacy of the revelations to Jeremiah and Moses. Daniel 9 does seem to say, however, that these revelations are not adequate by themselves for properly understanding the situation at the time of the audience. Jeremiah's prophecy needs to be amended with an additional revelation in order to be understood properly. Daniel 9 does not interpret Jeremiah in a derivative sense, but rather claims a second stage of revelation. Similarly, Daniel 9 does not polemicize against the revelation to Moses, but it does suggest that the Deuteronomic explanation of suffering, however adequate it may have been in the past, is not the proper way of understanding the situation at the time of the audience. We will consider the view of the revelation of Jeremiah first, then the portrayal of the Deuteronomic explanation of suffering, before concluding with some general comments about the assertions of authority in the Danielic apocalypses.

According to Daniel 9, the word of the Lord is true but the word of Jeremiah is incomplete. Daniel 9:2 begins with the assumption that the word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah is true,

בְּשֵׁנָה אַחַת לְמַלְכוֹ אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל בִּינָתִי בְּסִפְרֵי מִסְפָּר הַשָּׁנִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְּבַר־יְהוָה  
 אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא לְמַלְאוֹת לְחָרְבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה (Daniel 9:2)

Jeremiah as we have it mentions the seventy years in three verses, 25:11, 12; and 29:10.

The first mentions the ruin (חרבה),

וְהָיְתָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְחָרְבָה לְשָׁמָּה וְעַבְדּוֹ הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל שִׁבְעִים  
 שָׁנָה: (Jeremiah 25:11)

The main innovation in Daniel 9 is the “interpretation,” which is really an additional revelation, that seventy years are actually seventy weeks of years (Daniel 9:24). While this is the major explicit amendment, Daniel 9 also exhibits some selective reading of

Jeremiah in the understanding of חרבות ירושלם. Jeremiah 29:10 is apparently ignored or disregarded as a different prophecy of 70 years, since the return to the land is not the fulfillment of the prophecy,

כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה כִּי לִפִּי מְלֵאכָה לְבַבְלִי שְׁבַעִים שָׁנָה אֶפְקֹד אֶתְכֶם וְהִקְמַתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם  
אֶת־דִּבְרֵי הַטּוֹב לְהַשְׁיב אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה: (Jeremiah 29:10)

In Daniel 9 the return to the land, the anointed ruler, and the rebuilding are only milestones on the way to true restoration (Daniel 9:24-26). The conflict implied in Jeremiah 25:12, that the prophecy is fulfilled with the fall of Babylon, would probably have been considered resolved by the perspective in Daniel 7:12 that the loss of dominion does not constitute an adequate judgment of Babylon. Whatever may have been thought of Jeremiah 29:10 and considered implicit with regard to Jeremiah 25:12, there remains an important insight that only three words of Jeremiah 25:11 play any role in Daniel 9 (חרבה שבעים שנה), and one of them is trumped by a second revelation.<sup>35</sup> The acceptance of authority is tempered not only by the removal from context, ignoring problems suggested by the context of Jeremiah, but also by the fact that Daniel 9 goes against other received “solutions” to the seventy years. Daniel implicitly rejects the adequacy of 2 Chronicles 36:20-22;<sup>36</sup> Ezra 1:1; and Zechariah 1:12. The extent to which Daniel 9

---

<sup>35</sup> See Collins on the removal of the phrase from context and use “like a symbol in a dream.” Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 359.

<sup>36</sup> Fishbane makes a case for understanding Daniel 9 as an interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36:20-22 in light of Leviticus 26. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 482. It is important to recognize that even the “new” revelations do not come out of nowhere, but rich traditions of interpretation. It remains the case that Daniel 9 rejects the simple sense of Jeremiah 25 and 2 Chronicles 36. Relatively speaking, Daniel 9 authorizes its substantial innovation as a new revelation more than an as interpretation of 2 Chronicles 36. Again, there is much gray area on the spectrum of novelty, but Daniel 9 is less a borderline case than the Animal Apocalypse, and even there a line can be drawn between the apocalypses and Jubilees (see above, page 193).

assumes the veracity of Jeremiah 25:11 should not be mistaken for the canon-conscious interpretation that develops in some circles considerably later.

Daniel 9 transforms seventy years to seventy weeks of years not on the basis of a hook in the text, the context, or other received authority, but by claiming equal status as direct revelation. One could point to differences in the concept of revelation claimed in Jeremiah and the concept of revelation claimed in Daniel 9 (such as angelic mediation), but the revelations to Jeremiah and Daniel share the same basic source. Daniel does not denigrate the authenticity of Jeremiah's revelatory experience, but does suggest that Jeremiah did not receive (or did not record) a complete understanding. Jeremiah's revelation is trumped by a second stage of revelation that is not derivative of former revelation, but derives from the same heavenly source as the initial stage. The revised understanding is presented as an explicit revelation, not the product of Daniel's wisdom (but we should not set up fences between explicit narrative revelation and supplementary revelation that comes by way of revealed wisdom). Daniel 9 is rare among the early apocalypses for explicitly citing former revelation, but it is still a new revelation that does not primarily derive contents and authority from Jeremiah.

Although no particular passage is cited, the explanation of suffering assumed in the prayer of Daniel also comes from received authority, particularly the book of Deuteronomy, בְּאִשֶּׁר כָּתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה (Daniel 9:11, 13).<sup>37</sup> Although there are different ways of explaining the Deuteronomistic prayer in Daniel 9, most scholars agree that it is discordant in the context of the Danielic apocalypses.<sup>38</sup> I favor the view that the author

---

<sup>37</sup> See Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 350.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 359-360.

incorporated the prayer with full awareness of the tension between the explanation of suffering associated with Deuteronomy and the explanation revealed by the angel in the rest of the chapter.<sup>39</sup> The result is not a denial of the authenticity of Deuteronomy as revelation, but an assertion that a different understanding based on new revelation is necessary to understand the present circumstance.<sup>40</sup>

The primary discord is theological, but there are also narrative cues that a different explanation is being offered. First, no one listens to Daniel or lets him finish. The angel departs not as a result of what Daniel says, but at the beginning (9:23), and interrupts Daniel while he was still speaking (9:21). Not only does the angel not acknowledge the “confession” of Daniel, but proceeds to give a very different explanation.<sup>41</sup> Daniel had assumed that the suffering at hand is a result of the sin of Israel and comes as punishment from God to prompt repentance. The prayer also implies that restoration will come about as a result of repentance and supplication for divine mercy. After interrupting Daniel to break the news that his prayer was not worth listening to, the angel informs him that the time of restoration is determined and does not depend on repentance. Daniel 9:24 is somewhat difficult, but it does seem that the iniquity involved is not merely that of Israel. The suffering of Israel cannot be completely explained as

---

<sup>39</sup> This position is defended by Ibid., 348. Likewise Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 108-109. See also Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt* 238-240.

<sup>40</sup> As discussed in the chapter on the temporal axis, the apocalyptic worldview understands the present moment as a radical departure (for the worse) from the normal progress of history. Deuteronomy could be perfectly adequate as an explanation of “normal” suffering, but not the present eschatological crisis.

<sup>41</sup> As noted by Collins, “the theology of history in Daniel 9 is very different from the Deuteronomic theology of the prayer. The deliverance promised by the angel is in no sense a response to Daniel’s prayer.” Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 360.

punishment for its own sins; rather, Israel must wait while sinners build up sufficient merit for complete destruction (לְכֹלֵא הַפֶּשַׁע).<sup>42</sup> This idea is not new (Genesis 15:16), but it does complicate the Deuteronomic explanation. The sin of Israel and the righteousness of God are not the only parts of the suffering equation; evil is permitted to flourish so that the deferred punishment and reward can be greater (צִדְקַת עֲלָמִים). None of this denies that the explanation of suffering and the proposed response written in the law of Moses was legitimate revelation.<sup>43</sup> It does make clear, however, that the present circumstance is not the “normal” circumstance to which Deuteronomy applies. The eschatological sequence is a special time that demands a new revelation in order to be fully understood.

In conclusion, only in an indirect sense do the Danielic apocalypses derive authority from the received authority of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. There is a familiarity in the continuity, but what is said about the received authorities is that they are not sufficient authorities for the present. Daniel 9 does not solve interpretive problems in Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. Daniel 9 does not claim to explicate what Jeremiah or Deuteronomy mean internally, but to amend them with additional revelation. The major authority of the Danielic apocalypses is the claim to direct revelation provided by the genre “apocalypse”. The figure of Daniel contributes authority (perhaps because he was already associated with second-stage revelation), as do the descriptions of Daniel’s

---

<sup>42</sup> “The traditional Deuteronomic theology, then, which envisages the sin of all Israel, is not adequately nuanced for the situation envisaged in Daniel. Undoubtedly the sins for which atonement must be made include the transgression of Jews who forsake the covenant, but the emphasis is not on the punishment of Israel. Rather the idea is that evil must run its course until the appointed time.” Ibid., 354.

<sup>43</sup> Collins makes a point about Daniel 9 that is important to the general argument of this dissertation. In Jubilees, as in Daniel, presenting theological understanding in explicit tension with an alternative understanding does not alone constitute polemic. “There is an implicit rejection of the Deuteronomic theology of history in Daniel 9, although the author does not polemicize against it.” Ibid., 360.



response (especially 10:8-9), and the progress of history (*vaticinia ex eventu*). In several places the apocalypses simply assert their own veracity (8:26; 10:21; 11:2; 12:7; see also 2:45). The Jewish apocalypses at the time of Jubilees certainly have enough continuity with received authorities that we can easily identify them as Jewish, but when we look closely we find that the genre typically authorizes fundamentally new revelation.

#### 4.1.3. Jubilees

In the previous two sub-sections we explored the ways in which the typical apocalypses do derive contents and authority from received traditions, while finding that, on a spectrum from new to derived, they are fundamentally new. In this sub-section we will acknowledge the significant ways in which Jubilees is creative and, like any interpretation, needs to authorize itself. From a broad perspective, however, Jubilees is fundamentally derivative from received authorities. This is true not only in how closely it rewrites Genesis and Exodus, but in the way it brings in other received authorities even when it departs from the base. Jubilees packs scripture with more scripture. The typical apocalypses are not devoid of scriptural interpretation, but neither do they go about solving problems in a received text in a sustained or systematic way. The interpretation is typically implicit while the claim to independent revelation is explicit. It is not merely surprising to proceed from an apocalypse framework to a rewriting of publicly received revelations, it is discordant. By the theory of illocution of genre, and by observation of earlier Jewish apocalypses, a reader expects an apocalypse to present revelation that could not be gathered from reason and public knowledge. Jubilees is certainly creative, but derives its content and authority from received scriptures to a degree unlike any prior

apocalypse. Even in the specific cases where the points on the spectrum approach, a line can be drawn between revelation that could only be authorized as independent revelation, and interpretation that could stand as learned but mortal interpretation. Jubilees manipulates the line in that it claims to be independent revelation, leading the reader to expect contents that could not stand on human authority, but in fact delivers the type of content familiar to anyone steeped in the tradition of interpretation.

The main qualification to this sub-section is the extent to which Jubilees must authorize itself as interpretation. First, we shall consider the lesser degree to which Jubilees re-authorizes its base text, Genesis-Exodus. It has been suggested that Genesis needed to be authorized as revelation since, unlike much of the Pentateuch, it does not claim divine authorship.<sup>44</sup> Although this is an interesting potential problem that might be solved by framing the patriarchal stories explicitly as revelation, it is not clear that the author of Jubilees had this problem in mind, or that the genre “apocalypse” would have been the most efficient way of addressing it. It seems more likely that by the 150s BCE Genesis was considered an integral part of the law of Moses with the same basis of authority.<sup>45</sup> Jubilees may gesture towards explaining the authority of the received writings, but the primary flow of authority is from the received writings to Jubilees.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 52.

<sup>45</sup> Najman emphasizes the extent to which Jubilees gains from the pre-existent authority of the Torah, but also notes that the authority of the Torah is bolstered, “the laws endorsed by Jubilees are shown to have the authority of Mosaic Torah, while the authority of Mosaic Torah is at the same time shown to be rooted in a heavenly tradition ascribed to God and known to select individuals since the beginnings of history.” Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup 77 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 66.

<sup>46</sup> “Thus they claimed, for their interpretations of authoritative texts, the already established authority of the texts themselves.” Ibid., 45.

A related, and I think more significant, point is the assertion of the timelessness, not just of Genesis, but of the entire law of Moses. 1 Maccabees 1:11 suggests a roughly contemporary movement in Judaism that understood the laws separating Israel from the nations as a “late” development that could be disregarded in favor of a former unity. To this, Jubilees seems to respond that all the laws (and the separation of Israel in particular, Jubilees 2:19) existed from the beginning of creation.<sup>47</sup> By this explanation Jubilees is not so much authorizing Genesis or Mosaic law *per se*, but authorizing the interpretation that Mosaic law is not temporally limited—there was not a time before it existed nor will there be a time when it is no longer in effect. Thus we come to the next point, the need for Jubilees to authorize itself as interpretation.

We can be reasonably confident that the audience of Jubilees already accepted the authority of the “first law” written for Moses (Jubilees 6:22), which we can identify as some form of the Pentateuch.<sup>48</sup> The greater need was the need for Jubilees to authorize itself as the dictation Moses received shortly after receiving the written tablets. Najman has contributed greatly to understanding the authority conferring strategies in Jubilees.<sup>49</sup> She lists separately three strategies that I would group together as the genre “apocalypse” (heavenly tablets, angelic intermediary, reliable recipient), but describes well the

---

<sup>47</sup> VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 18-22. This point was recently elaborated by Segal, leading to an important observation, “The perspectives... can be reduced to one fundamental notion: God established the entire world order from the beginning of time.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 323.

<sup>48</sup> See especially Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 100, James C. VanderKam, “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly Bow, and Rodney Alan Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 268-273. We should not think of the Pentateuch so narrowly as to exclude variant readings or teachings that might not have been considered separable from the text in antiquity.

<sup>49</sup> Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 379-410. Najman, *Seconding Sinai*. See also Najman, *Prophetic Ends*, forthcoming.

authority conferred by recasting biblical traditions, matching the words and solving the problems of the Torah.<sup>50</sup> This section is particularly concerned with the overkill noticed by Najman, “it is remarkable that Jubilees should employ four different strategies when it might be supposed that one would have sufficed.”<sup>51</sup> I suggest that this would have been even more striking to the ancient audience, such that it would have been discordant to begin with an apocalypse and continue to hear a rewritten form of publicly received scripture. We should underestimate neither the degree to which any interpretation needs authorization, nor the degree to which Jubilees is a creative and novel interpretation. It is significant, however, that no contemporary text brings together “apocalypse” and “rewritten scripture” to such a degree. The rarity of the literary combination points to a tension at the level of typically implied worldview. The use of the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees cannot be explained simply as over-enthusiastic authorization of rewritten scripture. The genre brings not only authority, but a set of reader expectations that, when not met, creates discord.

Much work has already been done, and no doubt much remains to be done, to demonstrate the use of received scripture in Jubilees.<sup>52</sup> Jubilees is creative, but always works with received materials. Many themes and passages could be brought to illustrate both the creativity and derivativeness of Jubilees, but for the present purposes two points

---

<sup>50</sup> Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 380.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.: 389, 401.

<sup>52</sup> For starters, see J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 66 (Boston: Brill, 2000). Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*. George J. Brooke, “Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1-2: New Light from 4QJubilees<sup>a</sup>,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 39-57.

will suffice. First we will consider the use of a feature associated with the apocalypses, the heavenly tablets. Then we will look closer at chapter 23, a salient example of a passage in which Jubilees departs from the base text of Genesis-Exodus, but continues to work with received authority.

#### 4.1.3.1. The heavenly tablets

Fortunately, we need not duplicate the extensive work that has been done on the heavenly tablets in Jubilees and in general.<sup>53</sup> A simple but powerful point, for the present purposes, builds directly on the work of García Martínez. García Martínez studies all examples of recourse to heavenly tablets in Jubilees and organizes them into five categories, one of which is “new halakot.”<sup>54</sup> What is most remarkable here is that *the “new halakot” are not very new*. The tablets reveal the familiar, not the fantastic. To be fair, some of the other categories include some fairly innovative emphases.<sup>55</sup> There is

---

<sup>53</sup> Florentino García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243-260. Martha Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the *Book of Jubilees*,” in *A Multifarious Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, ed. Benjamin G. Wright, Scholars Press Homage Series; v. 24 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999), 25-29. Cana Werman, “The תעודה and the תעודות Engraved on The Tablets,” *DSD* 9, no. 1 (2002): 75-103. Leora Ravid, “המינוח המיוחד של לוחות השמים,” *Tarbiz* 68, no. 4 (1999): 463-471. Leslie Baynes, “‘My Life is Written Before You’: The Function of the Motif ‘Heavenly Book’ in Judeo-Christian Apocalypses, 200 B.C.E.-200 C.E.” (Dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame, 2004). Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 389-400. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 151. Shalom M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,” in *The Gaster Festschrift*, ed. David Marcus (New York: ANE Society, 1974), 345-353. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 313-316.

<sup>54</sup> García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 255-258.

<sup>55</sup> It would take a monograph by itself to consider completely where the 364-day calendar would fall on the spectrum from new to derived. Without resolving every related issue, it is at least plausible that the author and the author’s audience could have viewed this calendar as a received authority. Possible but debatable sources of this authority could have been: 1) memory of the way things used to be, with the assumption that they had always been that way; 2) an interpretation of the Astronomical Book of Enoch;

also a certain need to authorize a decision of which of the received traditions should be emphasized. Still, a brief consideration of the six most novel uses of the heavenly tablets will illustrate that Jubilees derives its authority from received traditions even when it uses a formal feature that cues a contrary reader expectation.

The first “new” legislation is the prohibition of public nudity in Jubilees 3:31. While it may be true that the received codes did not exactly anticipate the Hellenistic gymnasium, two considerations limit the novelty of the prohibition. First, Jubilees ties the prohibition to Genesis 3:21, where God causes Adam and Eve to wear clothes (וַיִּלְבָּשֵׁם). The conclusion that God wants all humans to wear clothes is closely derivative. The second consideration is more complex, but inevitable. Written traditions are significant, but not the only form of received tradition.<sup>56</sup> Using logic related to the logic associated with “natural law,” a Jewish writer could easily conclude that there is a cosmic reason for the way things have always been done by every (Semitic) society. The prohibition of nakedness is one of the laws taught by Noah in Jubilees 7:20, suggesting that this

---

and 3) an interpretation of some festival passages that seem to suggest that they always fall on the same day of the week, combined perhaps with an assumption that the day of atonement cannot conflict with the sabbath, or simply a worldview of a balanced and symmetric universe. Furthermore, Himmelfarb observes that in most of the passages García Martínez classifies as “calendar and feasts”, the innovation was the claim that the patriarchs observed the festival calendar, not the festival calendar itself. Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 26. Put in a different way, Jubilees must authorize the claim that the traditional way of doing things has the same authority as the law and covenant set down in the Pentateuch. In this case, the traditional festival calendar is as fixed a part of Israel’s covenant as the other issues fought over under Seleucid rule. Jubilees does *not* authorize the 364 calendar as an innovation. For more on the authority of non-written tradition, see Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 1-18.. For more on the identification of festival calendar with other non-negotiable covenant requirements, see Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 301-303..

<sup>56</sup> A later articulation of this issue can be found in Josephus, *Antiquities* 13.297, where the Pharisees, unlike the Sadducees, are said to accept regulations handed down but not written. See also Kister, “לתולדות כת האיסיים,” 1-18.

prohibition was revealed to and incumbent upon all nations, even if Noah's books were only passed on to Shem.<sup>57</sup>

The second "new" law attributed to the heavenly tablets states that a murderer is to be punished by the means with which he murdered (Jubilees 4:32). The idea here is closely related to the *lex talionis* (Leviticus 24:19-20). It is possible that Jubilees is implicitly disputing a tendency to "soften" the *lex talionis* with monetary substitution, as found later in Rabbinic law.<sup>58</sup> The explicit concern, however, is not whether Cain *should have been* punished, but whether he *was* punished. Genesis does not report the death of Cain, but Jubilees asserts that Leviticus 24 was applied to Cain supernaturally. The law is derivative of Leviticus 24 and the narrative is derivative of the theological principle that God enforces justice.

The third law listed as "new" by García Martínez is the requirement of circumcision on the eighth day. Again, later evidence indicates differences of opinion about whether the day could be delayed, but even if there is a halakhic dispute behind the emphasis on "no circumcising of days," the law itself is directly derivative. Genesis 17:14 mentions the eighth day in the LXX and Samaritan recensions, as do Genesis 17:12 and Leviticus 12:3 in all recensions.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> The relationship between the laws of Noah in Jubilees and the Rabbinic Noahide laws was studied by Finkelstein and Albeck. The relationship may not be direct, but Jubilees does have a concept that some laws are revealed to and incumbent upon all humanity, while others are revealed only to Israel. Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, 34-59. Louis Finkelstein, "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," *HTR* 16, no. 1 (1923): 59-61. Louis Finkelstein, "Some Examples of the Maccabean Halaka," *JBL* 49, no. 1 (1930): 21-25. Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)," 19 n. 128.

<sup>58</sup> García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 255.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 256.

The fourth example is more interesting. According to Jubilees 28:6 the custom cited by Laban of giving the elder daughter before the younger daughter is in fact a law on the heavenly tablets. Of course we cannot completely ignore the possibility that the author's own conscience suggested that this *should* be a law, but the logic is simply the converse of a basic principle in Jubilees. If the patriarchs practiced the laws then the practices of the patriarchs must be law. The word of Laban is probably less the authority than the assent of Jacob. The prohibition of marrying two sisters in Leviticus 18:18 seems to be in the background, although Jubilees does not explain how the law cited by Laban trumps Leviticus 18:18. The issue warrants further study, but for the present purposes it is clear that the law is derivative even though it interprets a custom as a law.

The fifth example, Jubilees 30:9, demands capital punishment for exogamy. Certainly Jubilees is novel in the emphasis on the issue, but the issue is not new (Ezra 9-10; Nehemiah 13:27) and the punishment is probably derived from the interpretation of giving a child to Moloch as exogamy (Leviticus 18:21; 20:2-5). This is not as tendentious an interpretation as it may first appear, since the context in Leviticus 18 concerns sexual relationships and Leviticus 20:5 uses the verb זנה. Any image of Moloch as a demon would only reinforce the interpretation as a prohibition of exogamy, due to the association of gentiles with demons.<sup>60</sup> Leviticus 21:9 also calls for capital punishment for the daughter of a priest that commits זנות. Again, for Jubilees, narrative example is an

---

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Jubilees 1:11. See the chapter on the spatial axis. See also, James C. VanderKam, "The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* ed. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Diethard Römheld (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 339-364. Todd R. Hanneken, "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses," *Henoch* 28, no. 2 (2006): 11-25. Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Angels, Demons, and the Dangerous Ones in Between: Reflections on Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in *Jubilees*," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.



authority right along with explicit legal formulae. The context here is explicitly Levi's slaughter of Shechem, and Phinehas' violent zeal against intermarriage is present in all but name. The divine approval of the latter in particular (Numbers 25:11-13) leads easily to the conclusion that exogamy is to be punished by death. This is another example of tendentious interpretation and emphasis, but the law is very much derivative of familiar authorities.

The sixth and final example is the law of tithes, including a second tithe, in Jubilees 32:10-15. This is not the place to resolve all the issues related to tithing laws in ancient Judaism.<sup>61</sup> Suffice it to say that, whether the author of Jubilees received or developed the solution, the problem was certainly received. Jubilees differs from the rabbinic solution,<sup>62</sup> but any solution short of source criticism is likely to conclude that at least two distinct tithes must be taking place. Among the "contradictions" are whether the tithe is given to a priest or a Levite (Deuteronomy 26:3-4; Numbers 18:21) and similarly whether it is "holy to the Lord" or can be eaten by resident aliens, orphans, and widows (Leviticus 27:30; Deuteronomy 14:29). The second tithe is most directly related to the *מַעֲשֵׂר מִן־הַמַּעֲשֵׂר* "tithe of the tithe" (Number 18:26). To be sure, the heavenly tablets authorize one solution to the exclusion of others. Even with this qualification, however, it is significant that Jubilees works with the materials of received authority, as creative as it may be in doing so.<sup>63</sup> Any good solution to problems and ambiguities in received

---

<sup>61</sup> García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 258. Finkelstein, "Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," 52-53. Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, 30-32.

<sup>62</sup> Finkelstein, "Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka," 52.

<sup>63</sup> García Martínez comments, "It is interesting here that the appropriate halakah on tithes is legitimated through recourse to the H[eavenly] T[ablets], which justify the exegesis that has been made upon a biblical basis." García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 258.

authority derives a certain authority. Recourse to a higher authority by way of the genre “apocalypse” raises the possibility of conspicuous overkill.

Although these six examples exhaust the category García Martínez calls “new halakot,” there are other examples that are somewhat new.<sup>64</sup> The examples above give a fair, though not exhaustive, sample of the use of the “heavenly tablets” authority in Jubilees. These are not just random examples of not-so-novel interpretations in Jubilees. Although the heavenly tablets are neither fundamental to all the apocalypses nor limited to apocalypses, heavenly tablets are one manifestation of the pattern in apocalypses of asserting direct recourse to heavenly authority.<sup>65</sup> It would be one thing if Jubilees simply used both authorizing mechanisms in different places. The literary discord comes in the fact that Jubilees frames derivative interpretation as an apocalypse, not only in the general framework of the book, but in specific passages with reference to the heavenly tablets.

A few examples will help illustrate the typical association of “heavenly tablets.” As much as the contents vary, there is never a case, besides Jubilees, when information is asserted to come from the heavenly tablets when it could just as easily have been derived from a known earthly authority. Even when the information is not described as a “secret” or “mystery,” it is novel and otherwise unavailable. In the Epistle of Enoch 103:1-2 the heavenly tablets are the source of knowledge of a “mystery” concerning future events. The Apocalypse of Weeks is likewise introduced with the heavenly tablets as the source

---

<sup>64</sup> See note 55 above.

<sup>65</sup> The “master paradigm” of *Semeia* 14 (1.4) lists “a written document, usually a heavenly book.” Collins, “Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre,” 6. Baynes attributes greater significance to the heavenly tablets as a constituent element that, among others, determines the genre “apocalypse.” Baynes, “My Life is Written Before You”, 166.

(93:2).<sup>66</sup> While verses 3-8 could be considered derivative, these verses are mere background for 9-17.<sup>67</sup> One can speak of traditional motifs and allusions, but on the scale of new and derived, the main part of the Apocalypse of Weeks is thoroughly new. In other sources, especially earlier sources, and sometimes in Jubilees, the tablets are not so much a source of revelation as a record of deeds to be used for assigning reward and punishment.<sup>68</sup> Still, it is safe to say that the ideas of mysterious revelation available only in heaven, and heavenly tablets in particular, were associated with the apocalypses.<sup>69</sup>

#### 4.1.3.2. Departures from Genesis and Exodus

As indicated by the foregoing, Jubilees persistently weaves other received authorities into its retelling of Genesis-Exodus. Although the vast majority of Jubilees follows Genesis 1 through Exodus 24, there are some noteworthy excurses. Significantly, however, even when Jubilees departs from the narrative of Genesis-Exodus, it works with received authorities. Rather than defining and surveying all the excurses, we will focus

---

<sup>66</sup> There may be room to doubt that the introduction was written at the same time as the apocalypse, but the correlation between 93:2 and 93:10 makes clear that it is meant as an introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks, and not the entire Epistle of Enoch.

<sup>67</sup> Indeed, the subject of the vision, as posted in the introduction, is not introduced until verse 10, “concerning the sons of righteousness, and concerning the chosen of eternity, and concerning the plant of truth” (93:2).

<sup>68</sup> For example, the Astronomical Book 81:1-2; Daniel 12:1. García Martínez counts two such uses in Jubilees (19:9; 30:19-22), but also discusses the ambiguity and possible overlap with the six passages he classifies “the Book of Destiny.” García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 246-250.

<sup>69</sup> For more on the ancient question of whether revealed wisdom was readily available on earth or required some sort of heavenly journey see Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 92-94.

on one salient example.<sup>70</sup> Jubilees 23 is of vital interest because it concentrates use of the genre “apocalypse” of the historical type. Jubilees 23 departs from the flow of the narrative in Genesis but continues to depend on received authorities. The chapter begins with the record of the longevity of Abraham in Genesis, and then molds Psalm 90, Isaiah 65, and the covenant curses (Deuteronomy 28 especially, also Leviticus 26) into a historical apocalypse. James Kugel has shown how the use of Psalm 90 is even greater than previously thought.<sup>71</sup> The use of Third Isaiah and especially Isaiah 65 is rather clear, and is especially interesting for our purposes because it demonstrates how a text can be received and used as part of the tradition even if a basic tension exists at the level of worldview. Even if some texts are used more (or in more ways) than others, the concept of received traditions must be understood broadly. There was no such thing as a canon that defined which works were supremely authoritative and which could not be used at all. The dependence on the covenant curses has also been long recognized, although it is striking that the thematic parallels do not mimic the exact wording. These three areas do not exhaust the use of received authorities in Jubilees 23, much less the book as a whole, but they do give a good sample of the flexibility and persistence with which Jubilees uses various traditions. Jubilees is almost always creative, but almost always has some familiar, received authority at the core.

**Psalm 90 in Jubilees 23.** The relationship between Psalm 90 and Jubilees 23 is not a mere case of thematic or linguistic parallel. Verse after verse influences Jubilees 23

---

<sup>70</sup> For further examples and discussion see, Brooke, “Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1-2,” 39-57. Brooke rightly emphasizes the integration of Deuteronomy and the prophetic texts, among others, into Genesis-Exodus to create a portrait of overall consistency.

<sup>71</sup> Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” 322-337.

on point after point. Kugel is careful to be clear that Jubilees 23 weaves in Psalm 90 but does not simply reword it. The effect is to derive authority from the received psalm for an interpretation that ultimately goes back to Genesis 25:7 (the lifespan of Abraham), “By weaving these other themes in with a few obvious references to Psalm 90, the author of Jubilees could provide the whole chapter with a certain legitimacy.”<sup>72</sup> Although the dependence on Psalm 90 does not compare to the overall dependence on Genesis-Exodus, the continuity of use of verse after verse distinguishes even this excursus in Jubilees from the tangential allusions typical of the apocalypses.

Psalm 90 itself can be understood as an interpretation of the problem of longevity, such that the first parallel is natural, and might not even be counted as a dependence if not for the continuation.

כִּי אֵלֶיךָ שָׁנִים בְּעֵינֶיךָ כִּיּוֹם אֶתְמוּל כִּי יַעֲבֹר וְאַשְׁמוּרָה בַּלַּיְלָה:

For a thousand years in your eyes are like yesterday gone by,  
or a watch in the night. (Psalm 90:4)

Jubilees had already made this familiar interpretation with respect to the death of Adam, “He lacked 70 years from 1000 years because 1000 years are one day in the testimony of heaven” (Jubilees 4:30). The decline of lifespan from a day to a portion of a day (אַשְׁמוּרָה), or a millennium to a portion thereof, is taken up in Jubilees, “For the times of the ancients were 19 jubilees for their lifetimes. After the flood they started to decrease from 19 jubilees...” (Jubilees 23:9). The image of grass withering and drying in the twilight of life, לְעֶרֶב יְמוּלֵל וַיָּבֵשׁ (Psalm 90:6), flows into Jubilees 23:9, 10. Verse 7, as so often in the Psalms, sounds vague at first, but actually fuels a specific point in Jubilees

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.: 336.

that suffering comes as punishment from God, not an independent force of evil (Jubilees 23:22-23),

כִּי־כָלֵינוּ בְּאַפֶּךָ וּבַחֲמַתְךָ נִבְהָלֵנוּ:

For we are consumed in your anger, terrorized by your wrath.  
(Psalm 90:7)

The most direct parallel comes from Psalm 90:10,

יְמֵי־שְׁנוֹתֵינוּ בָּהֶם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה וְאִם בְּגִבּוֹרֹת | שְׁמוֹנִים שָׁנָה  
וְרַחֲבָם עֲמַל וְאֹן כִּי־גַז חַיִּשׁ וְנִעְפָּה:

The days of our years are within seventy, or eighty at best,  
but still a rush of stress and affliction, as it passes quickly and is gone.  
(Psalm 90:10)

Together with Isaiah 65 (below), this forms Jubilees 23:15,

[JCVK] Then it will be said: ‘The days of the ancients were numerous—as many as 1000 years—and good. But now the days of our lives, if a man has lived for a long time, are 70 years, and, if he is strong, 80 years’. All are evil and there is no peace during the days of that evil generation.  
(Jubilees 23:15)

Even more significantly, Psalm 90 provides support for the idea of calendrical rectitude as key to repentance and restoration,

לְמִנּוֹת יְמֵינוּ בֵּן הַדָּע וְנִבְא לִבֵּב חֲכָמָה:

Teach us to count our days properly, that we may come to a wise heart.  
(Psalm 90:12)

As we shall see in the next section, Jubilees avoids any suggestion that one needs to be a sage to keep the calendrical and other commandments, but the idea that improper counting of days is part of the problem goes into Jubilees 23:19, and the idea that studying the laws properly brings restoration forms Jubilees 23:26. As one might expect,

restoration of length and quality of life are found both in Psalm 90:14 and Jubilees 23:27-

29. Kugel also shows how Psalm 90:15 is understood in Jubilees 23:27.<sup>73</sup>

שִׂמְחֵנוּ בְּיָמֹת עֲנִיתָנוּ שָׁנֹת רָאִינוּ רָעָה:

Gladden us (by giving back) the days you took away, the years we saw suffering. (Psalm 90:15)

In Jubilees 23:27 lifespan will be restored to 1000 years and, literally, “to many more years than many days,” or as VanderKam provides, “to more years than the number of days (had been).”

On one hand, Jubilees avoids verbal recycling. On the other hand, Psalm 90 finds more than a passing tangential allusion in Jubilees 23. The Psalm is not the sole foundation of the chapter, but several points in the Psalm appear at several points throughout Jubilees 23. Moreover, most of the parallels had not been noted before Kugel’s 1994 article, causing one to wonder how many other passages in Jubilees are infused with the authority of familiarity just below the horizon of modern scholarship. The closer one looks, the more it becomes apparent that Jubilees packs scripture with more scripture.

**Third Isaiah in Jubilees 23.** Isaiah 65 is a more complicated situation. Although Third Isaiah does not consistently fall on one side of the differences in worldview between Jubilees and the typical apocalypses, we shall encounter a good number of cases where Jubilees seems to disagree with Third Isaiah.<sup>74</sup> It is important to distinguish reference to received scriptures from endorsement of the worldview most apparently

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.: 334.

<sup>74</sup> This is hardly surprising, as the relationship between Third Isaiah and the apocalypses has long been recognized. See especially, Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*.

implied. Indeed, as a body of authoritative writings began to take shape out of heterogeneous components, it was inevitable that for any one thinker a preferred worldview would dominate and inform the reading of other texts. Writings were not approached with a “love it or burn it” mentality, and authority could be accepted at different levels and degrees. Thus, it should not surprise us if Jubilees uses Third Isaiah as an authority and takes up the issues while offering interpretations that seem to go against the plain sense. Although a certain degree of looseness with sources, as just seen with Psalm 90, is expected, we will observe some subtle ways in which Jubilees inverts Isaiah 65. Jubilees 23 more than alludes to Isaiah 65, but that does not mean the message is imported without revision.

Third Isaiah in general makes a number of “appearances” in Jubilees and chapter 23 in particular, but Isaiah 65-66 most intersects with the restoration account in Jubilees 23:28-31.<sup>75</sup> The first example is something of a variation in that the description of the restoration in Isaiah is adapted to describe the decline of history in Jubilees.

לֹא־יִהְיֶה מִשָּׁם עוֹד עוֹלָם יָמִים וְזָמָן  
 אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֹא אֶת־יָמָיו  
 כִּי הַנָּעַר בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יָמוּת  
 וְהַחוּטָּא בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יִקָּלֵל:

There will no longer be an infant or an elder  
 Who does not fill out its days.  
 One who dies at a hundred years old will be considered a youth,  
 And one who falls short of one hundred will be considered cursed.  
 (Isaiah 65:20)

---

<sup>75</sup> Nickelsburg and Endres have discussed the parallels between Third Isaiah and Jubilees 23. Nickelsburg argues that the cry in Jubilees 23:24-25 relates to Isaiah 63:15—64:1, whereas Endres prefers to describe a more general influence of Third Isaiah. The examples considered here may not be exhaustive, but are the most direct parallels (and some of them are not as direct as one might like). George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, vol. 26, Harvard Theological Studies (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 21-22. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, 58 (1982 86).



This verse influences two verses in Jubilees, the second of which was already mentioned in connection with Psalm 90:10.

[JCVK] At that time, if a man lives a jubilee and one-half of years, it will be said about him: ‘He has lived for a long time’. But the greater part of his time will be (characterized by) difficulties, toil, and distress without peace. (Jubilees 23:12)

[JCVK] Then it will be said: ‘The days of the ancients were numerous—as many as 1000 years—and good. But now the days of our lives, if a man has lived for a long time, are 70 years, and, if he is strong, 80 years’. All are evil and there is no peace during the days of that evil generation. (Jubilees 23:15)

In Chapter 6, on the temporal axis, we will consider the significance of the fact that Jubilees pieces together sources to establish an emphatically gradual decline, and how anything gradual contrasts with the typical view of history in the apocalypses. Here the main point is that Jubilees works with the material of Third Isaiah, which can safely be counted as received authority. A lesser point may also fit a pattern. Notice that Jubilees inverts the analogy—rather than one being reckoned accursed in the restoration, one is reckoned blessed in the decline.

Another fairly clear parallel, with another twist, is found in Jubilees 23:28. Here I include the Ethiopic and the translations of VanderKam and Charles (1902), and again the pertinent words from Isaiah 65:20.

ወአልቦ ልሂቀ ፡  
ወአልቦ ስይጸግብ ፡ መዋዕለ ፡  
እስመ ፡ ኩሎሙ ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ ወደቂቀ ፡ ይከውኑ

[JCVK] There will be no old man,  
nor anyone who has lived out his lifetime,  
because all of them will be infants and children.

[RHC] And there will be no old man  
Nor one who is [not] satisfied with his days,  
For all will be (as) children and youths. (Jubilees 23:28)

לֹא־יִהְיֶה מָשָׁם עוֹד יָמִים וְזָמָן  
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֹא אֶת־יָמָיו  
(Isaiah 65:20) כִּי הִנֵּה...

Line breaks are added to VanderKam's texts to aid comparison, and brackets are added to indicate Charles' emendation, which he mentions only in a footnote, "I have added the negative form from a comparison of Is. lxv. 20." VanderKam's translation is certainly acceptable, and probably goes back to שבע ימים, as he suggests.<sup>76</sup> Nevertheless, Charles is right to notice a parallel and right to notice a discord. Scholars, apparently including Charles himself in 1917, rejected the option of adding a "not" to make the text say what one would like it to say.<sup>77</sup> Without emending, the discord presumably goes back to the original work; the original audience, like Charles, might have expected the exact opposite. The net meaning is not very different, but it might seem that Jubilees is going out of its way to "mess with" or at least "correct" Third Isaiah. More explicably, Jubilees makes simpler sense of "infant" by moving it to an example of what there will be, not what there will not be. At any rate, it is at least clear that Jubilees is building from familiar authoritative texts. I would not push the suggestion that Jubilees is distorting Third Isaiah more than usual, since Jubilees' baseline for loose re-working of language is fairly high.

Nickelsburg also brings some looser parallels.<sup>78</sup>

זֶאֱבֹ וְטֹלָה יָרְעוּ כְּאַחַד וְאַרְיֵה בְּבִקְרָא יֹאכְלֵתֶבֶן  
וְנִחַשׁ עֶפְרָ לַחֲמוֹ לֹא־יָרְעוּ וְלֹא־יִשְׁחִיתוּ בְּכָל־הָרָקָדָשִׁי אָמַר יְהוָה:

<sup>76</sup> The phrase appears in Genesis 35:29; 1 Chron 23:1; 29:28; 2 Chron 24:15; and Job 42:17 as a way of referring to dying of old age.

<sup>77</sup> See VanderKam's note *ad loc.* and R. H. Charles and G. H. Box, *The Book of Jubilees; or The Little Genesis* (London, New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Macmillan, 1917).

<sup>78</sup> Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 21-22. See also the discussion in Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, 59-60 (1982 88-89).

The wolf and the lamb shall graze together,  
And the lion will eat grass like an ox.  
But the serpent's food is dust!  
They will not do harm and they will not destroy anywhere on my holy  
mountain, says the Lord. (Isaiah 65:25)

[JCVK] They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and  
joyfully. There will be neither a satan nor any evil one who will destroy.  
For their entire lifetimes will be times of blessing and healing.  
(Jubilees 23:29)

I would not be too confident that the audience would have made the comparison, but if they did, the implied differences are as striking as the similarities. Here the variations are not linguistic twists but implications at the level of worldview. In anticipation of Chapter 5, we can mention some possible implications that, if true, would be consonant with other findings. First, if the wolf is read to represent a foreigner and the lamb an ethnic Jew (as in the Animal Apocalypse), then Third Isaiah says they will co-exist in Jerusalem, whereas Jubilees says God will remove foreigners from the land of Israel (Jubilees 23:30). The possible connection between “serpent” and “satan” is more complicated; suffice it to anticipate here that Jubilees has a low view of the activity of contra-divine cosmic forces, at least as far as Israel is concerned. Consequently there is no satan to punish, only to be absent. Although Jubilees has a concept of “holy mountain,” the sanctification of the whole land of Israel in Jubilees 4:26 is discussed in 6.6.4.

There are still more suggested parallels, but the remaining can be mentioned only briefly. The parallel between Isaiah 65:13 (good Jews will be radically rewarded, bad Jews will be radically tortured) seems, if anything, an anti-parallel with Jubilees 23:30. The only overlap is the language of servants, contrasted with enemies. In Third Isaiah the vindication of the elect includes the punishment of other Jews. Jubilees avoids or condemns any suggestion of division within Judaism (see Chapter 5), and gives no

weight to vindictive judgment in the eschatological sequence (the nations are excluded from restoration, not tortured; see Chapter 6). There is a similar (anti-)parallel of reward and punishment between Isaiah 66:14 and Jubilees 23:31. Here however, there is also a specific verbal parallel, again inverted. In Isaiah “bones will sprout like grass” (וַיִּצְמַח הָעֵצִים כְּעֵשְׂבָא), but in Jubilees “bones will rest in the earth” (ወያዕርፍ : አዕሳላቲሆሙ : ውስተ : ምድር).

All these parallels are possible, but even if several of them are dismissed we can still make the basic point that is relevant here: Jubilees works with Third Isaiah as material even when it wanders off from Genesis-Exodus. Jubilees, at its moments of least “rewritten-ness,” follows received texts more closely than the average apocalypse when most derivative. Jubilees resonates with Third Isaiah and in a way absorbs its authority, even while making other claims to authority. The use of a received authority may invite comparison, but it does not answer the question of whether the worldview is consonant. One can receive an aspect of a tradition less enthusiastically than another aspect of the tradition. Jubilees 23, for example, draws from the apocalypses in genre, Third Isaiah as just discussed, and Deuteronomy as next discussed. The great extent to which Jubilees develops its worldview from Deuteronomy and not the others will be explored in the following chapters.

**The covenant curses in Jubilees 23.** Finally, Jubilees 23 fills the place of “final woes” in a historical apocalypse with the covenant curses of Deuteronomy 28 (and perhaps Leviticus 26). Although the thematic similarities are unmistakable and a number of images overlap, the dependence is not word-for-word. The closest point of contact is between Deuteronomy 28:49-50 and Jubilees 23:23.

וַיֵּשֶׁא יְהוָה עֲלֵיךָ אֶתְּנִי מִרְחוֹק מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ בְּאֶשֶׁר יִדְאָה הַנֶּשֶׁר  
 וַיֵּשֶׁא אֶשֶׁר לֹא־תִשְׁמַע לְשׁוֹנָיו:  
 וַיֵּשֶׁא עַל פְּנֵים אֶשֶׁר לֹא־יִשְׁמָע פְּנִים לְזִקְנָן וְנַעַר לֹא יִחַן:

The Lord will bring against you a nation from far away, from the end of the earth, like an eagle swooping down—a nation whose language you do not understand—an ominous nation that will neither respect old age nor have compassion for a child. (Deuteronomy 28:49-50)

ወያነቅህ : ላዕሌሆሙ : ኃጥአኒሆሙ : ለአሕዛብ : እለ : አልቦሙ :  
 ላዕሌሆሙ : ምሕረተ : ወሃህለ : ወለገጸ : መኑሂ : ኢያደልው : ኢለልሂቅ :  
 ወኢለወፊዛ : ወኢለመኑሂ : እስመ : እኩያን : ወኒያላን : ከመ : ይእከዩ :  
 እምኩሉ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ

[JCVK] He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old or young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. (Jubilees 23:23; cf. 4Q176 fragment 20)

The description of the foreign invader(s) is certainly similar, but the more significant parallels between the chapters are thematic. Chapter 6 will demonstrate how Jubilees both uses and adapts the covenant curses. The basic theological similarity is the claim that the “woes” of sickness, famine, and invasion are punishments from God intended to prompt sinners to repentance. The main adaptation, as we shall see, is to place the covenant curses in the form of the final woes of a historical apocalypse. Unlike the typical apocalypses, the woes are covenantal punishment, and more strikingly, they are adapted such that they can be understood to have been fulfilled in the past. Somewhat in language and imagery but more so in theology, Jubilees 23 aligns itself with the authority of Deuteronomy 28.

Psalms 90, Third Isaiah and Deuteronomy 28 do not exhaust the extent to which Jubilees 23 uses received authorities. The allusion to Psalm 79:2-3 in Jubilees 23:23 has been mentioned in Chapter 3, Davenport argues for use of Jeremiah 6:23 in the same

verse,<sup>79</sup> and Wintermute finds a number of other parallels worthy of marginal note.<sup>80</sup> The examples discussed suffice to give a fair evaluation of the use of received authorities in Jubilees 23. Without downplaying the extent to which Jubilees creatively molds its materials, Jubilees is persistently derivative. Derivative does not mean slavishly deferential, but it does mean that the contents, however rearranged, come from publicly received authority. Even when emphasis is shifted, a degree of authority is derived when the building blocks are derived. Even when Jubilees departs from “rewriting” Genesis-Exodus, Jubilees remains a “rewriting” of received authorities.

Jubilees 23 is a particularly salient example, but only one example of an excursus from Genesis-Exodus that continues to adhere to received traditions. Other examples would lead to interesting questions, such as the existence of a single written “Book of Noah,”<sup>81</sup> the subtleties of manner of use of the Book of Watchers,<sup>82</sup> the state of patriarch and priest Levi traditions before Jubilees,<sup>83</sup> or a non-textual but written map of the

---

<sup>79</sup> Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 34 n. 3.

<sup>80</sup> O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 99-102. In a more general way the theme of declining longevity depends on Genesis through Joshua (see appendix 6.6.1).

<sup>81</sup> See chapter 5 note 24.

<sup>82</sup> J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten emphasizes the very close verbal adherence to Genesis-Exodus, but finds the connection to the Book of the Watchers so loose that it should not be thought of as a literary dependence. Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*, 212. Ruiten, “A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch?,” 93. See also, VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” 229-251. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 179-188. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 110-121.

<sup>83</sup> See note 5 above.

world.<sup>84</sup> The excurses are important for establishing the limits of derivation, but we should not lose sight of the fact that the vast majority of Jubilees retells and interprets in a very direct way Genesis through Exodus 24.<sup>85</sup> One must also take into account that the text that became known as the Samaritan Pentateuch is no less received than that which became known as the Masoretic Text, and that even the interpretations, direct as they may be, were often received orally or in texts no longer known to us. All considered, Jubilees is persistently derivative of received authority. Alexander can plausibly suggest that the author of Jubilees “was the recipient of certain traditions which he honestly supposed went back to Moses himself.”<sup>86</sup> Jubilees is creative in ways more analogous to *objet trouvé* than to sculpture from raw clay.<sup>87</sup> Jubilees might be best understood as a reconstruction, based on scattered evidence, of heavenly tablets that must exist in order to explain the authority of the received tradition. Jubilees reconciles authorities and postulates a unity in the source of authorities that appear to be disparate, but Jubilees does not unveil new revelation.<sup>88</sup>

The point, however, is not simply that Jubilees differs from contemporary apocalypses in that it can be described as “rewritten” scripture, or that Jubilees differs

---

<sup>84</sup> Daniel Machiela, “From Enoch to Abram: The Text and Character of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) in Light of Related Second Temple Jewish Literature” (Dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame, 2007).

<sup>85</sup> See note 52 above.

<sup>86</sup> Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 101. See Jubilees 45:16 for the idea that the Levites preserved all the ancestral teaching in a broad sense.

<sup>87</sup> The analogy should not be taken too far, however. Authorship in antiquity fills the spectrum of “originality.” Creative reworking based on a large number of sources and traditions is better characterized as authorship than redaction. For a different view, see Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*.

<sup>88</sup> For the theological claim that the received traditions, and writings in particular, are unitary and consistent, see Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 17.

from other examples of rewritten scripture in that it claims to be an apocalypse. Jubilees makes claims and cues the reader to expect that something new is going to be revealed. If we distinguish the claims from the actual contents, we arrive at a clear discord.

Jubilees claims to be an independent revelation from the highest authority, on par with the Pentateuch itself. It is important to temper this statement with the fact that Jubilees seems to acknowledge the Pentateuch as “first” (Jubilees 6:22), and handed to Moses already written, whereas Jubilees is nominally secondary in that it was dictated.<sup>89</sup> The independence is also tempered by the fact that the first law and Jubilees are revealed from the same source to the same person in the same place at roughly the same time.<sup>90</sup> Still, scholars are on the right track to observe that the claim to revelation from the heavenly tablets in the form of an apocalypse is a claim to be on par with, not derived from, the Pentateuch.<sup>91</sup> The ancient audience, like modern scholars, would expect such a claim to introduce a new revelation that qualifies, rather than builds upon, the authority of the “first” revelation.<sup>92</sup> As we have seen, however, those expectations are not met. The claim does not concord with the actual content.

---

<sup>89</sup> See note 48.

<sup>90</sup> James C. VanderKam, “The Scriptural Setting of the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 13, no. 1 (2006): 61-72.

<sup>91</sup> Nickelsburg, “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture,” 347. Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 27-28. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 388. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 90. It is also important to be aware that these comments are partly in reaction to the assertion that Jubilees claims to supplant the Pentateuch, particularly by, B. Z. Wacholder, “Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Cambridge 1995, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and J. Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 195-211.

<sup>92</sup> See, for example, Nickelsburg, “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture,” 347.



Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse,” in general and in specific cues such as “heavenly tablets,” to create a reader expectation that is discordant with what is actually said. On purely literary grounds this can be labeled irony. The final chapter will turn to the question of intent. We should not jump to conclusions about sociological context. Irony is not necessarily polemic. The shift is relatively subtle. Jubilees does not shut down the possibility of an expanded understanding of revelation; it moves to tether the understanding of revelation to the received traditions, maintaining a unity and consistency. This is another way in which Jubilees, as has long been observed, promotes Jewish unity.<sup>93</sup>

#### 4.2. The dependence of revelation on wisdom

This section considers simultaneously two strands of one basic observation. (1) The basic observation is that revelation is closely aligned with wisdom in the typical early apocalypses, but not in Jubilees. (2) The first strand concerns wisdom *per se*, particularly the use of the term or a near equivalent,<sup>94</sup> in the context of a prerequisite to, result of, or identification with receipt of revelation. Jubilees avoids the term almost completely and qualifies the concept. (3) The second strand concerns the view of revelation as coded or otherwise inaccessible. Jubilees has a concept of “seeking” the

---

<sup>93</sup> See VanderKam’s discussion of Rönsch. VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 6. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis*, 520-521. “Es war das jüdische Unionsbuch, eine Formula Concordiae filiorum Israel.” My translation, “It was a Jewish unity-book, a formula of concord of the Israelites.” See also Schwarz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung*.

<sup>94</sup> We will not ignore the distinction Daniel makes between wisdom and enlightenment, but for the present consideration of a view of revelation as restricted to an elite, they function the same way.

laws, but it does not convey meaning in allegorical or symbolic codes, it does not read Genesis as if coded, and it diminishes codes that do appear in Genesis. (4) The important point for this dissertation is that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to frame a revelation that differs in the view of revelation from what a reader would expect from an apocalypse. (5) One might speculate further that what concerns Jubilees is not opposition to wisdom as a general virtue, but as a form of elitism. Jubilees seems to suggest that the laws by which covenantal fidelity and blessings can be achieved are accessible to all of Israel, regardless of intelligence, profession, esoteric initiation, or other form of elitism. The sub-sections will consider the Enochic apocalypses, the Danielic apocalypses, and Jubilees. First, each of the preceding introductory points should be explained further.

(1) The history of scholarship on the categories of “wisdom” and “prophecy” is as complex as that of “apocalyptic” discussed in Chapter 2.<sup>95</sup> The important development for the present purpose is that “wisdom” can include “revealed wisdom,” along with the

---

<sup>95</sup> Among the milestones, Gerhard von Rad challenged the tendency to view “apocalyptic” as the child of prophecy by arguing that the view of history makes it the child of wisdom. Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306. Müller refined von Rad’s point by specifying *mantic* wisdom. Müller, “Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik,” 268-293. See further on mantic wisdom, VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*. VanderKam, “Prophetic-Sapiential Origins,” 163-176. Hengel developed the category of “higher wisdom through revelation.” Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, 1st American ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 210-218. Smith and Stone advanced the study of the distinctive form of wisdom associated with the apocalypses. Smith, “Wisdom and Apocalyptic,” 131-156. Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 414-452. For discussion on the issues in Q scholarship (especially Kloppenborg and Mack), and as a significant contribution in its own right, see Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility,” 165-185. Goff has worked extensively on the overlap of wisdom and apocalyptic elements, most recently in Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007). For a recent review of scholarship, see Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSup 115 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 1-24. See also, Torleif Elgvin, “Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller, STDJ 35 35 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 15-38. Andreas Bedenbender, “Jewish Apocalypticism: A Child of Mantic Wisdom?,” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 189-196.

types of wisdom associated with the canonical wisdom literature. Not only are the genres “wisdom” and “apocalypse” compatible, the early apocalypses tend to identify wisdom and revelation. Revealed wisdom is not the only kind of wisdom, nor is it limited to the apocalypses, but it is typical of the early apocalypses. Jubilees exhibits a kind of revelation independent of wisdom.

(2) Although there is much more to revealed wisdom than use of the term “wisdom,” and the distribution of the term is not even, terminology provides a quick way of assessing different views of revelation. In the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses wisdom is an all encompassing category for that which is received when revelation is received, and that which defines the righteous. Jubilees, however, divorces revelation from wisdom. Jubilees uses the term twice, once to describe Enoch and once in connection with Joseph, but never uses the term to describe that which is revealed from the heavenly tablets, that which one must have in order to receive revelation, or that which one gains as a result of revelation. Jubilees elevates the intelligence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but avoids the terminology of wisdom and even attributes the rejection of a form of wisdom to the intelligence of Abram.

(3) The typical identification of apocalyptic revelation with revealed wisdom is related to the tendency to describe revelation as a mystery or to convey it in codes. The issue is not how easily the revelation might be decoded, but the assertion that revelation is mysterious, not easily grasped, or hidden from the ordinary mind. This view of limited access to revelation can be expressed in many forms. Lange has already shown how Jubilees differs from the typical apocalypses in that it rejects allegorical dreams.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 25-38.

Jubilees does not communicate in code, it does not read Genesis as if a code, and it downplays coded revelation within Genesis. More generally, Jubilees disambiguates the revelation that is necessary to be righteous and rewarded under the covenant. Jubilees presents the revelation received by Moses as if completely transparent. The laws should be studied in order to be observed, but without the expectation of a new revelation that will supersede the plain sense of the original (as in Daniel 9).

(4) The important point is that the worldview with respect to revelation in Jubilees is different from the worldview that is typically conveyed by the genre “apocalypse.” When a reader encounters the literary features of heavenly tablets revealed through an angelic intermediary to an exemplary human on matters of the cosmic realm and the meaning of history, the reader expects a certain view to be expressed about each of those things. In this case, one expects an apocalypse to convey a view of revelation as coded, mysterious, and accessible only to the wise. The discord between genre and worldview, between what the text leads the reader to expect by way of literary framework and what it actually says about the key issues raised by the framework, constitutes literary irony.

(5) Even without speculating on social context, it is not difficult to imagine what the concern might have been. The issue here seems to be related to the issue to be discussed in Chapter 5, that Jubilees addresses all of Israel without singling out a group for eschatological reward. “Wisdom” is often not just a general virtue attainable by anyone, but a set of learned skills that define an elite scribal class. Jubilees presumably aims to emphasize that the covenant between God and Israel is accessible to and incumbent on all of Israel, even those who do not have the luxury of devoting themselves

to the life of a sage,<sup>97</sup> even those who do not meditate on enigmas, and even those who are not particularly bright. Deuteronomy 30:11-14 illustrates the issue and the basic position taken by Jubilees:

כִּי הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְצַוֶּה הַיּוֹם לֹא-נִפְלְאָתָהּ הוּא מִמֶּדֶד וְלֹא רִחֲקָה הוּא:  
 לֹא בַשָּׁמַיִם הוּא לֵאמֹר מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ הַשְּׁמַיִמָה וְיִקְחָהּ לָנוּ וְיִשְׁמַעְנוּ אֹתָהּ וְנַעֲשֶׂנָּה:  
 וְלֹא-מֵעֵבֶר לַיָּם הוּא לֵאמֹר מִי יַעֲבֹר-לָנוּ אֶל-עֵבֶר הַיָּם וְיִקְחָהּ לָנוּ וְיִשְׁמַעְנוּ אֹתָהּ  
 וְנַעֲשֶׂנָּה:  
 כִּי-קָרוֹב אֵלֶיךָ הַדְּבָר מְאֹד בְּפִיךָ וּבִלְבָבְךָ לַעֲשׂוֹתוֹ: ס

For this commandment which I command you today is not too mysterious for you or far away.

It is not in the heavens, such that one might say, “Who will go up to the heavens to get it for us, such that we could observe and do it?”

Nor is it across the sea, such that one might say, “Who will cross the sea to get it for us, such that we could observe and do it?”

On the contrary, it is very close to you! In your mouth! In your mind! Do it! (Deuteronomy 30:11-14)

Although I do not claim a direct cause and effect, one could imagine the author of an Enochic apocalypse reading Deuteronomy 30 and wondering, “so just what is it in the heavens that is so interesting?,” or the author of a Danielic apocalypse, “what is this mysterious thing over the waters?”<sup>98</sup> Regardless of whether the author of Jubilees thought of the issue in terms of Deuteronomy 30, it is an apt description of the difference between the view of revelation typical of the apocalypses and that of Jubilees. In contrast to the view of revelation typically found in the apocalypses, Jubilees presents the law and testimony revealed to Moses at Sinai, and consequently the requirements for righteousness and reward under the covenant, as fool-proof.

<sup>97</sup> The present work does not endeavor to include ben Sira in the comparison, but the reader might occasionally notice that Jubilees seems to be more proximate to ben Sira than the apocalypses on some matters of worldview. Jubilees and ben Sira might agree that one should travel to the temple, not the cosmos, to find appropriate instruction (Sirach 24:23; Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 55.), but Jubilees does not share ben Sira’s elitism (see especially Sirach 38:24).

<sup>98</sup> Bodies of water are a recurring locus of revelation in the Danielic apocalypses (7:2; 8:2; 10:4).

#### 4.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses

The Enochic apocalypses tie revelation to wisdom (best described as revealed wisdom) and view revelation as coded or otherwise accessible only by way of wisdom. The apocalypses vary in the frequency with which the word “wisdom” is used to describe that which is revealed, and in the ways in which the inaccessibility of revelation is expressed. Among the variations, however, one can identify a common worldview that sees revelation as distant and restricted to an elite.

The most numerous explicit identifications of Enoch’s revelation with wisdom occur in the Epistle of Enoch and the Parables.<sup>99</sup> Even if the Epistle (other than the Apocalypse of Weeks) is dated after Jubilees, the numerous explicit references to Enoch’s revelation as wisdom indicate patterns that had been implicit in the earlier apocalypses, and especially how they were read close to the time of Jubilees. Thus, the Book of the Watchers uses the word “wisdom” rarely (that which will be given to the chosen in 5:8; the fruit which nourishes the holy ones in 32:3, 6; cf. the **חכמה** “knowledge” that humans are destined to understand in 14:3). Be that as it may, Nickelsburg, Argall and Knibb point to language and motifs that show wisdom to be a “comprehensive category” that designates the Book of the Watchers and Enochic literature in general, as well as that which defines the chosen. Among these are the wisdom term “parable” in 1:2, the list of contents in 2:1—5:3, and the pursuit of knowing everything in 25:2.<sup>100</sup> Argall uses 5:8 to argue that, “The phrase ‘to give wisdom’ is a

---

<sup>99</sup> Epistle of Enoch 92:1 (cf. 4Q212 fragment 1, column 2, line 23, **חכמה** [חכמה]); 94:5; 98:1,3,9; 99:10; 100:6; 101:8; 104:12; 105:1; Parables 37; 42; 49:3; 51:3; 48:1; 49:1; 61:7, 11; 63:2.

<sup>100</sup> Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 52. See also the observation illustrated from later examples in Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 416-418.

technical expression for Enoch's revelation."<sup>101</sup> Knibb discusses motifs such as sapiential admonition based on natural order (BW 2:1—5:4) and places of mystery outside the human realm (BW 17-19).<sup>102</sup> Especially in light of later developments, one can safely conclude that the Book of the Watchers was viewed as a book of revealed wisdom at the time of Jubilees.

Although the Book of the Watchers has been read as an allegory for priestly marriage purity,<sup>103</sup> the view of revelation as accessible only to a wise elite is better seen in the treatment of the "tree of wisdom" motif. In general, it is important not to conclude from the view of revelation as coded that the meaning is exhausted by the substitution of decoded equivalents.<sup>104</sup> The Book of the Watchers is a good example of an apocalypse the meaning of which is not exhausted by coded equivalents, in this case understanding the Watchers as priests. By means of comparison with Sirach, Argall has demonstrated how the Book of the Watchers uses the tree of wisdom motif to emphasize the remoteness and inaccessibility of wisdom, other than by way of a certain esoteric chain of transmission.<sup>105</sup> Although the Book of the Watchers does not develop the idea of stages of revelation to the same extent as the Danielic apocalypses, the role of the interpreting

---

<sup>101</sup> Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 20.

<sup>102</sup> Knibb, "Enoch in Light of Qumran Wisdom," 206-210.

<sup>103</sup> David Winston Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16," *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115-135. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600. The work can also be read as allegorical in the sense of the typology of *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*.

<sup>104</sup> Advanced by Gunkel and emphasized by Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 16-17.

<sup>105</sup> "In *I Enoch*, the great wisdom represented by the Tree is inaccessible to ordinary mortals. It is made known to angels and they, in turn, communicate it to Enoch through interpretations of his visions. Enoch then brings this wisdom from heaven to the chosen and righteous, who 'eat' it (82:3b)." Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 94.

angel functions within the same worldview. Even when revelation is right before one's eyes, one still requires interpretation from an authorized figure (e.g. BW 18:14).

The Apocalypse of Weeks explicitly defines “wisdom” as that which is given (one might say revealed) to the chosen (93:10; see also 91:10), and defines the chosen as a group apart from those who stray from wisdom (93:8). The apocalypse itself is part of that wisdom and exemplifies the view of revelation as cryptic. The point is not that the code is particularly difficult to crack, but that revelation is presented as if cryptic and only understood by a chosen few at a chosen time. Regardless of disputed social realities and the ease of cracking the code, the Apocalypse of Weeks uses the literary motif of esotericism.<sup>106</sup> Regardless of how elaborate a chronology might (or might not) be implied in the system of weeks, a week certainly represents something other than a week. The identification of the man that will be saved as Noah and the man that will be taken up as Elijah, for example, may not have been too difficult for the intended audience, but the references are presented as cryptic in the narrative setting. Again, revelation is presented as a code accessible only to the wise.

The Animal Apocalypse does not use a word for “wisdom” in its allegory, but the opening of eyes (90:6, and more frequently the absence thereof) functions the same way as does the revelation of wisdom in the Apocalypse of Weeks. The Animal Apocalypse is also a prime example of coded revelation. Again, the issue is not how many ancient Jews could have actually cracked the code, but that revelation is presented as if a code that is fully understandable only at a special time by an audience that is made to feel special.

---

<sup>106</sup> For more on separating the literary motif from social reality, see Adler, “Introduction,” 13-16. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 431-432. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 39. Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 339-340.



Wisdom is required to decipher the revelation, and further wisdom regarding current events results from the revelation. Wisdom is not a general virtue that describes all of Israel, but marks the boundaries of an elite group.<sup>107</sup>

#### 4.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses

The Danielic apocalypses vary from the Enochic apocalypses in some details of the view of revelation, but share the same basic worldview. Revelation is cryptic and accessible only to an enlightened elite. The elitism is moderated in that greater allowance is made for the “masses” to receive instruction from the enlightened. The masses might become righteous if they heed the enlightened, but they do not themselves become enlightened (Daniel 12:3). The elite are not isolated, but they remain exclusive. The elite are not distinguished by a skill set that can be taught, but by access to ongoing revelation. Revelation continues to be cryptic, as in the Enochic apocalypses, but the “code” moves further beyond the human realm of decipherment.<sup>108</sup> The decoding of revelation is not a matter of wisdom in the sense of human skill, but enlightenment in a purely revealed sense.

---

<sup>107</sup> See further, Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 52-53. If the discussion is extended to include the Epistle of Enoch, one finds an intermediate group comparable to the multitude in Daniel. In the Epistle 99:10 one finds an opportunity to become blessed, even if one cannot oneself become wise, by listening to the words of the wise. The dominant emphasis in the Epistle is on the wise themselves (see especially 104:12 and note 99 above).

<sup>108</sup> Carmignac held the revelation of secrets which are normally hidden from human intelligence to be essential to the apocalyptic worldview. He distinguishes the apocalypses from Rabbinic literature according to the means employed to excavate secrets from the Torah. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique,” 10, 20-21.

Thus, the first variation is the avoidance of the root חכם “wise” in favor of שכל (for lack of a better alternative) “enlightened.” For the purposes of comparing views of the elite accessibility of revelation, enlightenment is every bit as elite as wisdom and more so. “Wisdom” comes off almost badly, as a human skill vastly inferior to the access to heavenly revelation associated with enlightenment. Or rather, true wisdom is a trait that humans cannot fully possess, but only God, who reveals it as God wishes (Daniel 2:20-21).<sup>109</sup> Thus, in the book as a whole,<sup>110</sup> the root חכם usually refers to the Babylonian professionals whose skill is markedly less than the revelation of an enlightened person. Wisdom is still a part of Daniel’s mortal skill-set (Daniel 1:4, 17, 20), but Daniel denies the sufficiency of mortal wisdom.

וְאַנְהָ לֹא בַחֲכָמָה דִּיאִיתִי בִּלְמִזְכָּל־חַיִּיא רְזָא דְנָה גְּלִי לִי לְהֵן עַל־דְּבַרְתִּי דִּי פִשְׁרָא  
לְמַלְכָּא יְהוּדָעוֹן וְרַעֲיוֹנֵי לְבָבָא תַנְדָּע:

As for me, this mystery was not revealed to me by means of my own wisdom (superior as it is to all mortals), but in order to make known to the king the fact of the interpretation, so that you can know your own thoughts. (Daniel 2:30)

Although the orthodoxy of the Queen may be suspect, she too seems to recognize a difference between mortal wisdom and access to divine wisdom,

אִיתִי גְבֵר בְּמַלְכוּתָא דִּי רוּחַ אֱלֹהִין קִדִּישִׁין בֵּה וּבִיּוֹמֵי אָבוּא נְהִירוֹ וְשִׁכְלָתָנּוּ וְחֲכָמָה  
בְּחֲכַמְת־אֱלֹהִין הִשְׁתַּכַּחַת בֵּה ...

---

<sup>109</sup> The idea that wisdom and knowledge come from God is not new. What is striking is the emphatic contrast between learned human skill and revealed enlightenment. Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom,” 1-11.

<sup>110</sup> We are justified in not limiting the consideration to the apocalypses because the court tales establish the view of revelation that is used in the apocalypses. To an extent the authors of the apocalypses may have cast their worldview into the court tales (particularly in Daniel 1-2 and occasional redactional glue). To a further extent the view of revelation in the court tales may have attracted the authors of the apocalypses to attach the apocalypses to the court tales. The court tales cannot be the only basis for establishing the view of revelation in the apocalypses, but they are foundational.

There is a man in your kingdom that has a divine holy spirit. In the days of your father he was found to have illumination, enlightenment, and wisdom like the wisdom of the gods... (Daniel 5:11)

Again in Daniel 5:14, Daniel's wisdom needs to be qualified as different from ordinary wisdom, but "enlightenment" requires no qualification.

Apparently building on the view of wisdom as a human skill, the apocalypses never use the root חכם. The root שכל can be used rather loosely (Antiochus Epiphanes has it in the sense of "cunning" in 8:25; it seems to reflect a human activity in 9:13), but usually refers to a specific group and the (mediated) divine action which defines them.

The near identification of enlightenment with revelation appears in Daniel 9:22,

וַיֹּבֶן וַיְדַבֵּר עִמִּי וַיֹּאמֶר דְּנִיָּאל עֲתָה יֵצְאֵתִי לְהַשְׁכִּילָךְ בִּינָה:

He explained it to me, saying, "Daniel, I have just now come out to enlighten your understanding." (Daniel 9:22)

In Daniel 1:17 enlightenment is given by God to Daniel, with a scribal connotation (הַשְׁכִּיל) (בְּכָל-סֵפֶר, cf. 9:1). Access to this enlightenment defines Daniel himself as a משכיל in 1:4, and also a latter-day group of משכילים to be identified as the circle of composition (Daniel 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10). The latter-day enlightened ones show no humility in identifying themselves with Daniel, as the most significant difference is that they understand even more than Daniel himself did (12:8, 10).

Thus we come to an additional perspective on the view of revelation in stages already raised in the previous section. In Daniel, revelation is not a deposit left behind in the distant past to be preserved and passively studied. Rather, revelation is ongoing and cumulative, such that understanding improves with new revelation. The revelation at

Sinai was not complete (cf. Jubilees 1:26<sup>111</sup>), the prophecy of Jeremiah was not final (Daniel 9:24), and even the vision of Daniel was not immediately understood (12:8). The latter-day משכילים concern themselves with former prophecies and visions, but they reserve for themselves the final stage of revelation. Like Daniel, they have access to divine revelation, and they have the further advantage of seeing the events unfold in their own days.

Chapter 5 will return to the view of divisions of humanity for purposes of restoration (i.e., Daniel holds the enlightened up for special reward while Jubilees admits no eschatological divisions within Israel). The point for the present is that Daniel views revelation as accessible only to an enlightened elite, comparable to the identification of wisdom and revelation in the Enochic apocalypses. To a certain extent Daniel opens up the elitism by allowing the multitude to be instructed by the enlightened, but allowing the public to obey is hardly a democratic reform. The enlightened distinguish themselves from the masses not by teachable skills or knowledge, but by access to ongoing revelation. God reveals wisdom and enlightenment to the wise and the enlightened, not all of Israel (see again Daniel 2:21).

Another implication of the view of multiple stages of revelation is that all revelation becomes cryptic, regardless of whether it had seemed cryptic. The writing on Belshazzar's wall offers a particularly cryptic first stage of revelation (Daniel 5), and Daniel 2 emphasizes the independence of the second stage so much so that it occurs without knowledge of the first stage of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Daniel 2 also uses the

---

<sup>111</sup> "First and last" in Jubilees 1:26 indicates completeness, not necessarily eschatology, as is frequently found in Chronicles, הָרֵאשִׁיטִים וְהָאַחֲרִיטִים (1 Chronicles 29:29; 9:29; 2 Chronicles 12:15; 16:11; 20:34; 25:26; 26:22; 28:26; 35:27).

language of secrets (רִזְיוֹן, Daniel 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47) and mysteries (מִסְתָּרֵהָא, Daniel 2:22) for that which God reveals. Curiously, however, cognate language is not found in the apocalypses, even though the contents could be called mysterious to Daniel even after they are revealed (8:27; 12:8). The apocalypses are persistently cryptic, whether they are “deliberately elusive” (especially Daniel 7),<sup>112</sup> or round-about ways of referring to things such as units of time (time, times, half a time; two thousand three hundred mornings and evenings). The most significant implication comes from Daniel 9. Jeremiah’s prophecy had seemed anything but cryptic, but the meaning turned out to be other than what it appeared to mean. The received prophecy is decoded, “like a symbol in a dream.”<sup>113</sup> By extension, all of received scripture can be treated as a first stage of revelation, subject to amendment.<sup>114</sup>

It is common for ancient interpreters to treat received scripture as “cryptic” to an extent. Kugel uses the word to describe a common assumption among ancient interpreters, and Jubilees both describes and exhibits a process of “seeking out” the commands.<sup>115</sup> As we shall see, however, Jubilees draws the line with allegorical codes. It may never be clear how the author of Jubilees justified certain modifications of the received texts of Genesis and Exodus, but it is at least clear that Jubilees never makes the move Daniel makes. Daniel treats all revelation, whether in received scriptures or in

---

<sup>112</sup> Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 296.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 359.

<sup>114</sup> In the words of Fishbane, “Prophetic words are no longer predominantly living speech, but rather inscribed and inscrutable data whose true meanings are an esoteric mystery revealed by God to a special adept and his pious circle (cf. Dan 9:22-23, 10:14-21, 11:33-5, 12:9-13).” Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 484.

<sup>115</sup> Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 15. Jubilees 23:26.

visions, as a code that can be amended with further revelation, showing relatively little regard for the original.

Daniel differs from the Enochic apocalypses in significant ways, but shares use of the literary genre “apocalypse” and the basic view of revelation as cryptic and accessible only to a wise elite. The genre necessarily raises the issue of revelation, and typically presents that which is revealed as mysterious, ambiguous, esoteric and elite, reserved for a particular group at a particular time.<sup>116</sup> Jubilees, however, uses the genre to frame what it claims was revealed clearly at Sinai for all Israel to understand and obey.

#### 4.2.3. Jubilees

In Jubilees revelation is fully accessible to all of Israel. This is most striking in what it does not say, but also in some positive emphases. Jubilees never uses language of “secret” or “mystery,” and uses the word “wisdom” only twice, neither of which compares to the “comprehensive category” of wisdom in the Enochic apocalypses or enlightenment in Daniel. Only in a very general sense are “sapiential motifs” used. Jubilees does not use codes, symbols or allegories, and downplays them where they appear in Genesis. The worldview of Jubilees also comes out in some positive emphases. Most generally, the revelation of the heavenly tablets at Sinai is presented as public instruction for all Israel for all time. Jubilees elevates the intelligence of Abraham, for example, in such a way that effectively critiques a kind of wisdom. In general, Jubilees pursues a course of disambiguation, not reveling in enigmas.

---

<sup>116</sup> The idea that the Danielic apocalypses are intended for a time other than the time of Daniel is emphasized in 7:28; 8:19, 26; 10:14; 12:4, 9.

The differences are at times dramatic and at times subtle. The claims Jubilees makes seem to leave some problems unresolved, especially from a modern perspective. It may be difficult to get past the perspective of a Jubilees as a pseudepigraphon that inherently implies the inadequacy of former revelation and invents “new” revelation, or views former revelation as an inaccessible secret code. Yet, as Alexander<sup>117</sup> and Kugel<sup>118</sup> have already suggested, the author of Jubilees claims and appears to believe that the Book of Jubilees sets down the instructions and clarifications<sup>119</sup> that were revealed to Israel at Sinai.<sup>120</sup>

#### 4.2.3.1. Revelation without the elitism of wisdom

Jubilees strikingly avoids the distinctive language and motifs of “wisdom,” particularly in the context of access to revelation. In more subtle ways, Jubilees elevates the intelligence of biblical heroes without, or even in opposition to, certain aspects of “scribal” or “mantic” wisdom. The net effect is to emphasize the claim that the heavenly

---

<sup>117</sup> “The likeliest explanation is, however, that he was the recipient of certain traditions which he honestly supposed went back to Moses himself.... The author of Jubilees may have felt that he was simply collecting and editing the esoteric traditions that had been faithfully passed down in priestly circles from the time of Moses to his own day.” Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 101.

<sup>118</sup> “Suppose we were to be able to talk to the author of Jubilees and say, ‘Come on, what’s all this with the heavenly tablets and the angel of the presence? You made this up!’ The author could reply in all seriousness, ‘not a word.’” Kugel’s point had more to do with the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy in general—how an author can assume an identity to such an extent that the imagined or reconstructed conversations take on a reality of their own. This point would not distinguish Jubilees from contemporary apocalypses, but it remains significant that Jubilees is a prime example of a pseudepigraphon in which it is relatively easy to see how the author found the basis to reconstruct or imagine content. March 18, 2004, Liss Lecture, Univ. of Notre Dame; confirmed by correspondence August 21, 2007.

<sup>119</sup> In the word of the Damascus Document, מְדֻקָּדֵק (CD column 16 line 3).

<sup>120</sup> See also, Najman, *Seconding Sinai*.

tablets were made clearly accessible to all of Israel. This emphasis is not unique in Jewish thought in antiquity, but it contrasts sharply with the view of revelation typical of the apocalypses.

Jubilees does not often appear in scholarly discussion of wisdom and the apocalypses. When Benjamin Wright set out to study wisdom in Jubilees for the 2007 Enoch Seminar, which was mostly dedicated to Jubilees, he confirmed the lack of distinctive sapiential features in Jubilees.<sup>121</sup> Although he went on to discuss less distinctive motifs, such as parent-child instruction, the most striking observation is the initial observation, the absence of wisdom features. Indeed, the words “mystery” and “secret” never appear, and the word “wisdom” appears only twice.<sup>122</sup> One of these is merely a variation of Genesis 41:39 on the lips of Pharaoh about Joseph, “We will not find a man as wise and knowledgeable as this man, for the spirit of the Lord is with him” (Jubilees 40:5).<sup>123</sup> This verse is also the closest Jubilees comes to a sapiential usage of

---

<sup>121</sup> Benjamin G. Wright, “Jubilees, Sirach, and Sapiential Tradition,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

<sup>122</sup> Determined by searching an electronic copy of VanderKam’s translation. The translation is so literal that it seems safe to conclude that the Ethiopic term ብሔር is not otherwise used. Margin of error remains possible in circuitous phraseology for the concept of wisdom, text variants not used in the translation, and the usual remote possibility that a word or passage was lost to the Ethiopic manuscript tradition.

For later examples of the view of scripture study as a means for unveiling נסתרות, see the discussion of the Damascus Document and Community Rule in Gary A. Anderson, “The Status of the Torah Before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Document and the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 10-19. Jubilees may have a concept of not-yet revealed laws in Jubilees 33:16, but nothing remains unrevealed after Sinai.

<sup>123</sup> Jubilees 42:2 omits the detail in Genesis 44:5 about Joseph performing divination with a cup, an activity that could be linked to mantic wisdom.



አእምሮ “knowledge.”<sup>124</sup> The other mention of wisdom does not come from Genesis directly, but the received expansions about the figure of Enoch.

(11QJub frag. 3 ln. 2) [n]שאר הו vac[at

ውእቱ : ቀዳሚ : ተምህረ : መጽሐፈ : ወትምህርተ : ወጥበበ : እምእንለ :  
 እመሕያው : እምእለ : ተወልዱ : ዲበ : ምድር :: ወዘጸሐፈ : ተእምረ :  
 ሰማይ : በከመ : ሥርዓተ : አውራጊሆሙ : ውስተ : መጽሐፍ :: ከመ :  
 ያእምሩ : እንለ : እምሕያው : ጊዜ : ዓመታት : በከመ : ሥርዐታቲሆሙ :  
 ለለ : ወርኅሆሙ ::

[JCVK] He was the first of mankind who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed patterns of their months so that mankind would know the seasons of the years according to the fixed patterns of each of their months. (Jubilees 4:17)

This is a fair description of the figure of Enoch developed in the received traditions, plus some emphasis on calendrical rectitude. Jubilees is not opposed to understanding the figure of Enoch as a wisdom hero from the chosen line, but Enoch’s wisdom is not a paradigm which all subsequent recipients of revelation (ultimately all of Israel) must follow.<sup>125</sup>

As has long been recognized, Jubilees receives Jewish traditions that develop the figure of Enoch in the paradigm of the eastern sage, making him the first of scribes

---

<sup>124</sup> God has knowledge in Jubilees 2:2. The tree of knowledge (not wisdom) appears not where one would expect in chapter 3, but later in Jubilees 4:30. As for humans, knowledge is never mentioned positively. It is evil in Jubilees 5:2, and departs in 23:11. Although Rofé found in this a movement of opposition to the idea that wisdom comes with age, the term here need not have any sapiential connotation, polemical or otherwise. Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom,” 3-4.

<sup>125</sup> There are, however, those who hold the figure of Enoch and the Enochic worldview as foundational to the view of revelation in Jubilees. See Kvanvig, “Jubilees—Between Enoch and Moses,” 246-261. In recent works Boccaccini is moderating the claim that Jubilees develops directly out of Enochic Judaism. Boccaccini, “From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism,” forthcoming. Cf. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 86-98.

whose wisdom includes astronomy and a body of learning well beyond literacy.<sup>126</sup> Again, Enoch's wisdom is not a general virtue attainable by all, but a set of learned skills that define the "scribal" profession. Jubilees does not polemicize for or against the figure of Enoch, or a certain kind of professional wisdom. The issue is more subtle: How does the worldview of the author shape the portrayal of Enoch? What is developed, and what is adapted or left behind? If we focus only on the issue of revelation, three emphases stand out. First, the lessons Enoch learns about calendar are transmitted to all the children of Eve, not an elite school of professional sages or esoteric "chosen righteous." Second, Enoch's astronomical learning is carefully limited to calendrical rectitude. Observing the signs of heaven (ܬܗܝܠܐ : ܠܡܢܐ) for any other purpose is strictly forbidden. Third, Jubilees embraces written-ness as a means of ensuring accuracy, but leaves behind the associated activities of sages. Writing is a device for guaranteeing public record, not an elite or cryptic channel of secret wisdom. Though somewhat adapted, Enoch is still allowed to be Enoch, the originator of wisdom in the mode of eastern sages, and he fits into Jubilees' account of revelation-history. Enoch is a sage who receives revelation, but not all who receive revelation are sages. Wisdom and the figure of Enoch have their place in Jubilees, but they do not define the view of revelation. Other recipients of revelation are taught to write, but are not otherwise associated with the term "wisdom" or the activities of the sages.

---

<sup>126</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 180-185. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 263-269. The fact that Enoch also offers incense points to the connection between Babylonian scribal curriculum and Jewish priestly curriculum, on which see, Henryk Drawnel, "Priestly Education in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*Visions of Levi*) and *Aramaic Astronomical Book* (4Q208-211)," *RdQ* 22 (2006): 547-574. More recently, Henryk Drawnel, "Some Notes on Scribal Craft and the Origins of the Enochic Literature," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

For example, Abram’s realization of God’s absolute sovereignty would have had the potential to take the form of “revealed wisdom.” In fact, Jubilees crafts Abram’s intellect in such a way that avoids revealed and mantic wisdom, and carefully limits the legitimacy of astronomical wisdom.

[  
 עם [תרח אביו בחרן שני שבועי שנים *vacat* ובשבוע השני]  
 בחמש] ה בו ישב אברם בלילה בראש החודש השביעי להביט אל  
 הכוכב]ים מערב עד בקר לראות מה מעשה השנה בגשמים ויהי  
 הואה] יושב לבדו ומביט ויבוא דבר בלבו ויאמר כול אותות  
 הכוכב]בים  
 (11QJub frag. 8 lines 1-6)

ወበሳድስ ሰባዔ፡ በዓመት፡ ኃምሉ፡ ሎቱ፡ ነበረ፡ አብራም፡ በሌሊት፡  
 በሠርቀ፡ ወርሃ፡ ሳብዕ፡ ከመ፡ ያበይን፡ ከዋክብተ፡ እምሰርክ፡ እስከ፡  
 ነግሀ፡ ከመ፡ ይርአይ፡ ምንተ፡ ግብረ፡ ዓመት፡ በዝናማት፡ ወሀሎ፡  
 ውእቱ፡ ባሕቲቱ፡ ይነብር፡ ወያቤይን፡ ወመጽአ፡ ውስተ፡ ልቡ፡ ቃል፡  
 ወይቤ፡ ኩሉ፡ ተአምረ፡ ከዋክብት፡ ወተአምሪሃ፡ ለወርሃ፡ ወለፀሐይ፡  
 ኩሉ፡ በእደ፡ እግዚአብሔር ። ለምንት፡ አነ፡ እትኃሠሠ፡ ለእመ፡  
 ፈቀደ፡ ያዘንም፡ ነግሀ፡ ወሰርክ፡ ወእመ፡ ፈቀደ፡ ኢያወርድ፡ ወኩሉ፡  
 ውስተ፡ እዴሁ ።

[JCVK] In the sixth week, during its fifth year, Abram sat at night—at the beginning of the seventh month—to observe the stars from evening to dawn in order to see what would be the character of the year with respect to the rains. He was sitting and observing by himself. A voice came to his mind and he said: ‘All the signs of the stars and the signs of the moon and the sun—all are under the Lord’s control. Why should I be investigating (them)? If he wishes he will make it rain in the morning and evening: and if he wishes, he will not make it fall. Everything is under his control’.  
 (Jubilees 12:16-18)

Enoch may have known the proper use of observing the signs of the sky (fixing a calendar), but the eastern sages err in attempting to fix the *character* of the year. Jubilees limits Enoch’s licit astronomical observation to calendar (Jubilees 4:17), and traces the illicit kind of astronomical observation to the watchers, by way of Kainan (Jubilees 8:3; cf. BW 8:3). Abram learns to write, but the rest of the package of sagely wisdom is left

behind. Most importantly, Abram (like Noah, Isaac, Jacob, Levi and Moses) does not have to be “wise” in order to receive revelation.

Jubilees elevates the intelligence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but never fashions them into wisdom heroes. Most revelation is elite in that it is limited to the chosen line, but the receipt of revelation is not a special skill limited to a sagely elite. Jubilees lacks not only the language of “wisdom,” but any trace of the elitism of the **משכילים** over the **רבים**, or the chosen righteous who consume wisdom like fruit. The issue can be illustrated with an example outside the apocalypses. Ben Sira denies that one can become wise if occupied with tending herds (Sirach 38:25), but for Jubilees, this kind of wisdom is of little use to the herdsmen Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In the next sub-section we will consider some of the individual revelations received by the patriarchs for how they disambiguate allegory and vague meaning. To conclude this sub-section we will consider the prime example of radically non-elite revelation, the Sinaitic revelation of law and testimony to all of Israel.

It is easy to think of Jubilees as revelation involving heavenly tablets, the angel of the presence, and Moses, and forget about the people of Israel at the base of the mountain. Jubilees does not vary from Exodus in the point that the revelation is for all of Israel. The point only stands out in comparison with the apocalypses. The revelation contained in Jubilees is not intended only for a later generation, it is not limited to a chosen few, it is not sealed up or kept secret. It is instruction on how to keep the covenant that is binding on all of Israel. Jubilees both asserts that it is for all Israel, and carries out the program of accessibility throughout the book.

From the first verse after the prologue, Jubilees introduces itself as revelation received by Moses “so that you may teach them” (**כִּי־תִלְמַדְתֶּם**, Jubilees 1:1). Jubilees

provides frequent reminders of the ultimate recipients of the revelation, **ወእንተ ፡ አዝዝ ፡ ለደቂቀ ፡ እስራኤል** “Now you [Moses] command the Israelites...” (Jubilees 2:26, 29; 6:13, 20, 32; 15:28; 28:7; 30:11, 17, 21; 33:13, 18; 41:26; 49:15, 22). Other explicit statements include, **ዝንቱ ፡ ሕግ ፡ ወስምዕ ፡ ተውህበ ፡ ለደቂቀ ፡ እስራኤል ፡ ሕግ ፡ ዘለዓለም ፡ ለትውልደሙ** “This law and testimony were given to the Israelites as an eternal law throughout their generations” (Jubilees 2:33; 3:14; 49:8).<sup>127</sup> Jubilees also provides for continuity of the teaching office, “He [Jacob] gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today” (Jubilees 45:16).<sup>128</sup> The concern for continuous written transmission also relates to the assertion of reliable, distortion-free transmission, which brings us to the next sub-section. By itself, there is nothing shocking to the idea that revelation was given at Sinai to all of Israel with no distinction of an esoteric group, hidden away for a distant time, or a requirement of special wisdom skills in order to grasp the revelation. The discord comes as this thoroughly public, fool-proof revelation is framed as an apocalypse.

#### 4.2.3.2. Revelation made unambiguous and accessible

Dramatically different from the apocalypses, and even compared to the base text of Genesis, Jubilees disambiguates revelation. Jubilees avoids allegorical symbolism and

---

<sup>127</sup> Like Deuteronomy 29:21, Jubilees 1:5 refers to a future generation who will suffer divine punishment before realizing their errors. From a historical-critical perspective this may be the actual original audience (still like Deuteronomy), but Jubilees claims to have been instructed to all of Israel for all time.

<sup>128</sup> The lack of sectarian division of Israel will come to the fore again in chapter 5, on the spatial axis. The distinction of the Levites is traditional and public, not comparable to the groups singled out in the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses.

potentially ambiguous visions. Jubilees does not communicate in code, does not read Genesis as if a code, and downplays codes that do appear in Genesis. Jubilees introduces angelic teachers not as interpretive guides of fantastic visions, but as tutors for language and memory skills, guaranteeing the clarity and accuracy of the laws and testimony.

We begin with the observation of Armin Lange that Jubilees rejects the allegorical dreams typical of apocalyptic literature.<sup>129</sup> The issue is not whether God communicates in dreams, but the allegorical nature of the dreams.<sup>130</sup> Lange follows Artemidorus in distinguishing allegorical dreams from theorematic dreams, which are understandable without interpretation. Jubilees adds only theorematic dreams, minimizes the allegorical aspect of the dreams of Joseph, and recasts Enoch's dream vision as theorematic.

Among the examples of dreams added, but conspicuously unlike the apocalypses in directness and objectivity, is Levi's dream,

ወንደረ : በይእተ : ሌሊት : ውስተ : ቤቴል : ወሐለመ : ሌዊ : ከመ :  
 ሢምዎ : ወረሰይዎ : ለክህነት : ለአምላክ : ልዑል : ኪያሁ : ወውሉዶ :  
 እስከ : ለዓለም :: ወነቅሀ : አምንዋሙ : ወባረኮ : ለእግዚአብሔር ::

[JCVK] That night he stayed at Bethel. Levi dreamed that he—he and his sons—had been appointed and made into the priesthood of the most high God forever. When he awakened, he blessed the Lord. (Jubilees 32:1)

---

<sup>129</sup> Lange, "Divinatorische Träume," 25-38. Lange also deals with the Genesis Apocryphon and concludes, "allegorische Träume zur Abfassungszeit des Jubiläenbuches positiv fast ausschließlich in Werken verwendet wurden, die der apokalyptischen Bewegung nahestehen oder aus ihr stammen" (page 35). My translation, "Allegorical dreams were used at the time of the composition of Jubilees almost exclusively in works which are close to the apocalyptic movement or originate from it." The present argument approaches exclusivity differently because of the distinction of literary genre, worldview and movement. If the worldview is typical and distinctive of the apocalypses it is apocalyptic even when found outside the literary genre. The movement of origin is irrelevant for the present discussion.

For a broader discussion see Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*.

<sup>130</sup> Jubilees seems to interchange dreams and visions. Compare Genesis 15:1 (vision) and Jubilees 14:1 (dream).

Another unambiguous dream in addition to the base text is also found in Jubilees 41:24, where Judah is told that he is forgiven. The heavenly tablets appear in dreams, but these are not symbols of anything other than tablets, and the message is never ambiguous (see Jubilees 32:21).

Lange finds allegorical dreams in Jubilees only in the retelling of the Joseph story, and even then downplayed. Joseph's dreams of the sheaves and the stars are simply omitted (Genesis 37:5-9). Jubilees mentions that Joseph correctly interpreted the dreams of the butler and baker, but does not recount the dreams themselves (Jubilees 39:16-17; Genesis 40:8-23). The dreams of pharaoh are also assumed as necessary to advance the story, but not only are the contents omitted, any dramatic tension about the interpretation is spoiled from the first sentence, "At that time the pharaoh had two dreams in one night about the subject of the famine which would come on the whole land" (Jubilees 40:1).<sup>131</sup> Jubilees is not trying to replace Genesis or polemicizing against the legitimacy of allegorical dreams in Genesis, but Jubilees does present its own revelation according to its own worldview of no-nonsense revelation. Whatever complex and ambiguous stories may have been received by Israel, the bottom line of covenantal fidelity, the law and the testimony, is completely unambiguous.

Similarly, Lange continues, Jubilees 4:19 refers to a dream vision of Enoch (presumably the Animal Apocalypse or the entire Book of Dreams) with no mention of any symbolism. We might add that there is also some variation in the response of Enoch and the audience. The Animal Apocalypse concludes with Enoch disturbed and weeping

---

<sup>131</sup> Werman studies the tendency in Jubilees to diminish dramatic tension. Cana Werman, "היחס 'לגויים' בספר היובלים ובספרות קומראן בהשוואה להלכה התנאית הקדומה ולספרות חיצונית בת התקופה" (Dissertation, Hebrew University, 1995).

(90:41-42), while Jubilees 4:19 emphasizes the objective clarity, “He saw everything and understood.” The Enochic apocalypses are not always clear on whether Enoch’s revelation was made public or kept esoteric, but Jubilees emphasizes the public nature of Enoch’s testimony, **ወጸሐፎ ፡ ስምዐ ፡ ወአንበሮ ፡ ዲበ ፡ ምድር ፡ ላዕለ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ደቂቀ ፡ እንሰ ፡ እመሕያው ፡ ወለጎውልዶሙ**. “He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all the children of Eve and for their generations” (Jubilees 4:19).

Lange’s study advances the present argument, even though his conclusion operates with slightly different categories. Lange concludes that Jubilees opposed the apocalyptic movement and cannot be called apocalyptic, but he does not separate literary genre, worldview and movement.<sup>132</sup> The view of revelation as cryptic is part of the worldview, not the definition of the literary genre, even if the worldview is typically implicit in the illocution of the genre. The worldview of Jubilees on this issue is not the worldview typically found in apocalypses, but that does not necessarily indicate the literary genre used (or the social origin of the work).

In addition to the allegorical dreams considered by Lange, there are other examples of disambiguation in Jubilees. For example, Genesis 49 was a hotbed of ambiguous meaning, particularly the prediction of the royal destiny of Judah.

לֹא־יִסּוּר שִׁבְט מִיְהוּדָה וּמַחֲקֶק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילָה<sup>133</sup> וְלֹא יִקָּהֵת עַמִּים:

The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, until tribute comes to him; and the obedience of the peoples is his.  
(Genesis 49:10, NRSV)

---

<sup>132</sup> Lange, “Divinatorische Träume,” 35.

<sup>133</sup> Qere: שִׁילָה



Jubilees makes only a brief mention of the deathbed blessings of Jacob at that particular place in the story.

benedixit israhel filios suos priusquam moreretur et indicavit  
quaecumquaecumque uentura essent eis in terra aegypti nouissimis diebus  
Et benedixit eos. et ioseph benedixit dupliciter in terra

Israel blessed his sons before he died. He told them what would happen to  
them in later days in the land of Egypt. He blessed them and blessed  
Joseph with double territory. (Jubilees 45:14)<sup>134</sup>

It is not the case, however, that Jubilees gives no further account of Jacob's prediction.

The first change is that Jubilees moves the revelation to explain how Jacob knew all this.

Genesis 49 gives no indication of how or even that Jacob's oracle was divine revelation, but Jubilees attaches it to an elaborated revelation event at Bethel. The second change is that the revelation is not oracular in the sense of poetic ambiguity, but becomes a matter-of-fact statement.

Interestingly, however, Jacob is not the first to receive revelation about the future role of Judah. Earlier, a spirit of prophecy had descended into Isaac's mouth,

ወለይሁዳሂ : ይቤሎ : የሀብክ : እግዚአብሔር : ኀይለ : ወጽንዐ : ከመ :  
ትኪደመ : ለኩሎመ : እለ : ይጸልኩክ : መኩንን : ኩን : አንተ : ወአሐዱ :  
እምነ : ውሉድክ : ለውሉደ : ያዕቆብ

[JCVK] Then he said to Judah: May the Lord give you the power and  
strength to trample on all who hate you. Be a prince—you and one of your  
sons—for Jacob's sons. (Jubilees 31:18)

---

<sup>134</sup> Although it does not matter for the present purposes, this translation comes from the Latin, rather than VanderKam's preferred reading from the Ethiopic, as discussed in chapter 6 note 118. The issue there is whether Jubilees reads בְּאַחֶרֶת הַיָּמִים from Genesis 49:1 to mean the future relative to Jacob but not the second century, or future in a sense of unrealized eschatology. Even if one favors the Ethiopic text over the Latin, there is an additional, if not absolute, emphasis that Jacob foretells what will happen *in Egypt*. The word order in Ethiopic and Latin makes it unlikely, but not impossible, that "in Egypt" indicates where Jacob told them what would happen, not where it would happen. Ethiopic manuscripts 21, 35 and 63 (from the first, third and fifth best families), like the Latin, lack a conjunction between "in the land of Egypt" and "in later days."

Jacob also received at Bethel a revelation that overlaps in content with Genesis 49:10,

[ואת הארץ והפריית־ההרביית־בה במאוד מאוד ומלכים ממכה יהיו]  
[וימש] לֹא בכול מדרוך כִּי רגל בני אדם ואתן לזרעכה את כול הארץ אשר תחת  
(4QpapJub<sup>h</sup> 1 ll. 1-2)

ወይቤሉ : ካዕበ : አነ : ውእቱ : እግዚአብሔር : ዘፈጠርኩ : ሰማየ : ወምድረ :  
ወአልህቀክ : ወአበዝነክ : ፈድፋደ : ጥቀ : ወነገሥት : እምኔክ : ይከውኑ :  
ወይኤንኑ : በኩለሄ : ወእደ : ኬደ : አሰረ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ ::

ubicumque fecerint uestigium pedum suorum aduersus filios hominum

He spoke to him a second time: “I am the Lord who created heaven and earth. I will increase your numbers and multiply you very much. Kings will come from you, and they will rule wherever they set foot against anyone.” (Jubilees 32:18)<sup>135</sup>

A more general connection is made between Genesis 49 and Jubilees 32.

וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֶל־בָּנָיו וַיֹּאמֶר הִנְּסֶפֶן וְאֵגִידָה לָכֶם אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא אֲתֶכֶם בְּאַחֲרִית  
הַיָּמִים:

Jacob called his sons and said, “Gather around so I can tell you what will happen to you in days to come.” (Genesis 49:1)

[הלִי]לֵה וְהִנֵּה מֶלֶךְ [אך] (4QpapJub<sup>h</sup> 1 line 5)

ወርእየ : በራእየ : ሌሊት : ወናሁ : መልእክ : ይወርድ : እምሰማይ : ወሰብዑ :  
ሰሌዳት : ውስተ : እደዊሁ : ወወሀቦ : ለያዕቆብ : ወአንበሶን : ወአንበበ : ኩሉ :  
ዘጽሐፍ : ውስቴቶን : ዘይከውን : ሉቱ : ወለውሉዱ : በኩሉ : ዓለማት ::

[JCVK] In a night vision he saw an angel coming down from heaven with seven tablets in his hands. He gave (them) to Jacob, and he read them. He read everything that was written in them – what would happen to him and his sons throughout all ages. (Jubilees 32:21)

Jubilees is not at all opposed to the idea that Jacob received revelation about the destiny of Judah. The striking shift, for the present purpose,<sup>136</sup> is that Genesis 49 was an

<sup>135</sup> Again, this translation follows a reading defended elsewhere. The problem is not relevant to the present issue. See 6.6.3.

<sup>136</sup> There are, of course, other interesting issues in these texts, including the formulation of the royal prophecy with respect to a single figure, not a dynasty, and the tendency (or complete replacement, depending on the manuscript) toward fulfilling the prediction in the past (relative to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century) history of Israel, rather than the eschatological future.

ambiguous oracle with no mention of how Jacob gained his knowledge, and Jubilees turns it into a matter-of-fact, perfectly clear revelation with all the authority of God, the heavenly tablets, the angel of the presence, and continuous written transmission. This same revelatory sequence brings us to an additional point, the transformation of angelic teaching from interpretive guide of the wonders of the cosmos, to a tutor in language and memory skills.

There are subtle but noteworthy differences in the way angels teach in Jubilees compared to the typical apocalypses. More will be said in Chapter 5 about how Jubilees develops transcendent figures from the spatial axis. The point relevant to the view of revelation is that, in the apocalypses, angels typically provide explanations of otherwise ungraspable wonders, and even their interpretations often leave an enigma or two. The authority of their revelation is often taken for granted, or indirect as a general divine commission.

In Jubilees, the angels have less autonomy in that they transmit revelation from the heavenly tablets, not their own voices (Jubilees 6:35).<sup>137</sup> When angels are not simply delivering or dictating tablets, they are tutoring the skills required to guarantee reliable written transmission. They may offer an occasional aside about what should be obvious from the heavenly tablets (e.g., the chosen place for the temple is Jerusalem, not Bethel; Jubilees 32:22), but they do not provide independent interpretations of ungraspable mysteries. Thus, in the revelation to Jacob at Bethel just discussed, the angel facilitates the revelation by delivering the heavenly tablets and guaranteeing an accurate copy.

---

<sup>137</sup> “For I know and from now on will inform you—not from my own mind because this is the way the book is written in front of me...” If one takes it as a contradiction that the angel seems to offer occasional asides, then it is an ancient contradiction. Jubilees, consistently or not, presents the revealing angel as a zero-interference transmitter.

ወይቤ ፡ ያዕቆብ ፡ እግዚአ ፡ እፎ ፡ እዚካር ፡ ዘከመ ፡ አንበብኩ ፡ ወርኢኩ ፡  
 ኩሎ ፡ ወይቤሎ ፡ አነ ፡ አዜክረክ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ወዐርገ ፡ እምነቤሁ ፡ ወነቅሀ ፡  
 እምንዋሙ ፡ ወተዘከረ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ዘእንበበ ፡ ወዘርእየ ፡ ወጸሐፈ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ነገረ ፡  
 ዘአነበበ ፡ ወዘርእየ

[JCVK] Then Jacob said: “Lord, how shall I remember everything just as I have read and seen”? He said to him: “I will remind you of everything”. When he had gone from him, he awakened and remembered everything that he had read and seen. He wrote down all the things that he had read and seen. (Jubilees 32:25-26)

In the case of Abram an angel is assigned the relatively mundane job of teaching, *NELC 100: Introduction to Classical Hebrew* (Jubilees 12:25-27). The overall trend suggests a worldview. Revelation is not an angelic interpretation of cosmic mysteries to a bewildered recipient, followed by an esoteric chain of transmission. Rather, revelation consists of clear and direct instructions through a passive angelic messenger to a well-trained and supervised copyist, passed down (or re-revealed) in a continuous line. The ultimate source of revelation is the heavenly tablets, and they were completely revealed to all Israel at Sinai. This revelation was fool-proof and need only be preserved and studied, not amended.

The individual points considered in this chapter constitute various perspectives on the same coherent worldview with respect to revelation. The accessibility of revelation relates to the public reception of revelation, which relates to the familiarity of authority. Like Deuteronomy 30, Jubilees emphasizes that there are no excuses for covenantal infidelity. Everything that one needs to know can be easily known, and indeed is already known from the received tradition. In a sense, Jubilees may inherently be a work of creativity and “decoding,” or at least searching, of tradition. Nevertheless, Jubilees does obey its own rules. Revelation has a single source, and so must be consistent with and

derived from received revelation. The traditions of Israel attributed to Sinai are sufficient for all time, including both before Sinai and beyond the eschatological turning point to eternity. The revealed covenant is incumbent on, and hence accessible to, all of Israel. Jubilees testifies to the sufficiency of the tradition far more than it challenges it.

The worldview conveyed in Jubilees is not particularly surprising in the general context of Judaism in antiquity, nor is it surprising that one text would differ in worldview from other texts. The surprise is that one worldview is conveyed in the framework of a literary genre that typically conveys a contrary worldview. From the first chapter of Jubilees, and in frequent reminders throughout the text, Jubilees presents itself as a revelation of heavenly tablets through an angel to an exemplary ancient figure. Jubilees uses the genre as defined in *Semeia* 14 and exemplified by prior works such as the early Enochic apocalypses and Daniel. The use of the genre creates reader expectations. These expectations come from observation of prior examples, as well as an inherent implication in the illocution of a genre. A reader expects an apocalypse to convey new, mysterious, and elite revelation partially because that is what other apocalypses convey, and partially because such a claim lends itself to authorizing revelation that cannot be authorized by more mundane means. The use of a genre itself conveys meaning, and the decision to frame Jubilees as an apocalypse bears special significance, since it could have been framed as “fidelity to the eternal covenant for dummies.” In purely literary terms, we can observe irony in the fact that Jubilees uses a genre to create a reader expectation of a worldview that is inverted and implicitly critiqued.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES AMONG THE APOCALYPSES

VOLUME II

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate School  
of the University of Notre Dame  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Todd Russell Hanneken, A.B., M.T.S.

---

James C. VanderKam, Director

Graduate Program in Theology

Notre Dame, Indiana

June 2008

## CONTENTS

### Volume II

Chapter 5: The Spatial Axis.....	261
5.1. Angels and demons.....	264
5.1.1. Before the flood: the origin of evil.....	265
5.1.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses.....	265
5.1.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses.....	268
5.1.1.3. Jubilees.....	269
5.1.2. After the flood: the persistence of demons.....	272
5.1.2.1. The early apocalypses.....	273
5.1.2.2. Jubilees.....	274
5.1.3. Angelic mediation.....	277
5.1.3.1. Evidence outside the apocalypses.....	277
5.1.3.2. The early apocalypses.....	281
5.1.3.3. Jubilees.....	283
5.1.4. The leader of evil.....	285
5.1.4.1. Terms, names and titles.....	286
5.1.4.2. Satan in non-apocalypse received scriptures.....	291
5.1.4.3. The early apocalypses.....	293
5.1.4.4. Mastema in Jubilees.....	294
5.1.5. Angels and demons in the eschatological crisis and restoration.....	301
5.1.5.1. The early apocalypses.....	302
5.1.5.2. Jubilees.....	304
Jubilees 23.....	305
The rest of the book.....	307
5.2. Humans.....	310
5.2.1. Groups.....	310
5.2.1.1. Third Isaiah.....	312
5.2.1.2. The Enochic apocalypses.....	313
5.2.1.3. The Danielic apocalypses.....	318
5.2.1.4. Jubilees.....	320
5.2.2. Violence.....	329
5.2.2.1. Third Isaiah.....	332
5.2.2.2. The Enochic apocalypses.....	332
5.2.2.3. The Danielic apocalypses.....	334
5.2.2.4. Jubilees.....	338

Chapter 6: The Temporal Axis .....	347
6.1. The decline of history .....	349
6.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	349
6.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel .....	353
6.1.3. Jubilees .....	355
6.2. The final woes.....	357
6.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	359
6.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses .....	366
6.2.3. Jubilees .....	367
6.2.3.1. The “final woes” are just chastisement from God as prescribed by the covenant. ....	369
6.2.3.2. The “final woes” have already been fulfilled.....	371
6.2.3.3. The white children.....	379
6.3. The judgment.....	385
6.3.1. The Enochic apocalypses .....	386
6.3.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel .....	388
6.3.3. Jubilees .....	391
6.3.3.1. Jubilees 23 .....	392
6.3.3.2. The rest of Jubilees.....	395
Judgment in Jubilees 5 .....	396
The role of Enoch in judgment.....	397
The judgment of individual nations .....	400
6.4. The restoration.....	405
6.4.1. Third Isaiah.....	406
6.4.2. The Enochic apocalypses .....	408
6.4.3. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel .....	412
6.4.4. Jubilees .....	413
6.4.4.1. The restoration in Jubilees 23 is gradual and has already begun. ....	414
6.4.4.2. The restoration in Jubilees as a whole restores and fulfills the original plan of creation. ....	417
Revelation .....	418
The people of Israel.....	420
The land of Israel .....	426
The sanctuary .....	429
The calendar .....	430
6.4.4.3. The periods of history in Jubilees .....	433
6.5. Conclusion to the chapter on the temporal axis.....	434
6.6. Appendices: Background issues and difficult readings related to the temporal axis .....	436
6.6.1. The problem of the correlation between longevity and righteousness ....	436
6.6.2. Who were the descendents of Lot and Caphtor in the second century BCE? .....	439
6.6.3. Jubilees 32 promises conquest in the land of Israel, not a global empire.....	442
6.6.4. The sanctification of the land .....	447



6.6.5. Jubilees 1:26-29 identifies the indwelling of the sanctuary in the restoration with the indwelling of the sanctuary of Aaron.....	449
6.6.6. The fiftieth year in Leviticus 25 and Jubilees 50 .....	456
Chapter 7: Review of Ironic Use of the Genre “Apocalypse” in Jubilees .....	460
7.1. Jubilees 1, the framework .....	462
7.2. Jubilees 2, creation.....	468
7.3. Jubilees 3-6, evil, injustice, and the lack thereof.....	469
7.4. Jubilees 10, the other nations.....	473
7.5. Jubilees 15, heavenly outsourcing .....	476
7.6. Jubilees 16-22, miscellanea .....	478
7.7. Jubilees 21, Enoch + Noah = Leviticus .....	480
7.8. Jubilees 23 .....	482
7.9. Jubilees 24-46, more miscellanea .....	498
7.10. Jubilees 30-32, six reasons to love Levites.....	499
7.11. Jubilees 39-43, “Do you not know that a man takes pleasure in his cup, as I do in this cup?” (the Joseph cycle) .....	505
7.12. Jubilees 47-50, revealing the past.....	507
Conclusion .....	510
Bibliography .....	515
Index of Modern Authors.....	534

## CHAPTER 5

### THE SPATIAL AXIS

The use of the genre “apocalypse,” by definition, entails use of literary contents from the spatial axis, particularly cosmic beings such as angels and demons. The use of these literary features implies some treatment of the significance of cosmic beings for humanity. Thus far, Jubilees is like contemporary apocalypses. Despite variation in the details, contemporary apocalypses typically attribute great significance to cosmic forces for the origin of evil, the progression of human history, and the resolution of evil. Jubilees breaks this convention. Jubilees uses the genre to deal with the significance of cosmic forces, but inverts the view typical of the apocalypses. Jubilees blames humanity for the origin of evil and the flood, postulates that Israel is exempt from angelic rule and demonic affliction, and simply writes angels and demons out of the plan for the resolution of evil. This is not to say that angelic beings play no role in Jubilees except to be unimportant. The apocalyptic worldview is only one of many concerns in the Book of Jubilees, and, like many non-apocalypses, Jubilees does use angels to solve exegetical problems. The core issue is the view of non-human sources of evil and suffering. Jubilees uses the genre but inverts the typical view.

The view of angels and demons constitutes the core of this chapter, but along the same lines as the agency of non-human forces we will consider the classification and

agency of groups within humanity. Even if a classification of humanity does not necessarily follow from the illocution of the genre, it at least holds that contemporary apocalypses typically limit the eschatological reward to a defined group within Israel. Jubilees does not deny that some are more righteous than others, or that the return to righteousness begins with a few and progresses slowly. Yet in chapter 23 and throughout the book, Jubilees treats all Israel without internal division (other than the traditional distinction of the sons of Levi). Furthermore, while significant differences exist between Daniel and the Animal Apocalypse on the view of violence, Jubilees differs even where these agree by rejecting any form of human participation in eschatological violence. Although the issues of human classification and violence are less central to the spatial axis than the agency of angels and demons, it is important to consider the departure of Jubilees from the typical worldview on these issues. The inversion of the apocalyptic worldview in Jubilees is not limited to theological abstractions, but entails tangible social implications. One should not overstate the explicitness of the argument or overemphasize this among the many concerns of the Book of Jubilees. However, it does seem to follow from this pattern that Jubilees rejects in principle the dissolution of Jewish unity, and particularly sectarian violence in the present and in eschatological hopes.

In this chapter in particular we must keep in mind that the apocalyptic worldview is not a system of doctrines but a cluster of compatible views. In both superficial imagery and substantial implications, the emphasis in Daniel differs from the Enochic works, which themselves speak in multiple voices. If one is only comparing Daniel and Enochic apocalypses, there is no doubt that one finds significant differences in the way that humans and non-human forces are imagined to function in the cosmic drama. I am neither developing nor denying these differences, but attempting to show that in the

broader frame of contemporary Jewish thought, Daniel and Enochic works stand together in ways that Jubilees stands apart. Jubilees is similar to these works in the use of the genre “apocalypse,” the basic tenets common to Judaism at the time, and even some further notions. Indeed, there is no single “non-apocalyptic” worldview or social group. Yet, as we consider the coherence and the diversity of Jewish thought in antiquity, it is important not to miss the exceptional use of the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees.

This chapter will not exhaust the issues related to the spatial axis. The “heavenly tablets,” already discussed in the chapter on revelation, also pertain to the spatial axis. Also related to the temporal axis, the earthly restoration contrasts with distant places of judgment. The “angelic liturgy” is yet another way in which Jubilees develops the spatial axis, and again contrasts with other angelic liturgies.<sup>1</sup> A number of other issues could be developed if one were inclined to argue from trajectory and later developments. For example, in light of Josephus’ description of the Essenes as naming angels,<sup>2</sup> it stands out that Jubilees does not name the revealing angel or any other angel,<sup>3</sup> apart from the disputed case of Mastema.<sup>4</sup> Rather, we will focus on the issue of angels and demons in five parts: evil before the flood, after the flood, angelic mediation, a leader of evil, and

---

<sup>1</sup> The angels serve as precedent or analogy for the special rank of Israel and its priesthood in Sabbath observance (Jubilees 2:17-21, 28), circumcision (Jubilees 15:27), and the liturgy (Jubilees 30:18; 31:14).

<sup>2</sup> *Bellum* 2.142

<sup>3</sup> One might even consider the possibility that Jubilees not only abstains from the naming of angels, but subtly jabs at the naming of angels in BW 6:7 (and parables 69:2) by identifying Danel not as an angel but a human patriarch. In Jubilees 4:20, Danel is Enoch’s father-in-law. The safest assumption is that this is a coincidence stemming from two independent attempts to imagine appropriate names. It would create a dissonance, however, if the audience made a connection. Would a fan of the Enochic literature rather imagine that Enoch married a female giant, or that BW errs in naming a patriarch as an angel?

<sup>4</sup> See the sub-section in this chapter on the leader of evil.

cosmic agents in the eschatological crisis and restoration. We will then consider the classification of humanity and the views of violence.

### 5.1. Angels and demons

The apocalypses typically explain the human situation in terms of independent cosmic agents. Bad angels and demons explain the presence of evil and suffering, and even good angels can be temporarily impeded or otherwise inefficient. Jubilees uses angels to fill certain exegetical needs, and addresses their significance in human affairs. Unlike the apocalypses, however, Jubilees denies that the angels are in any way independent, capricious or incompetent forces interfering in the relationship between God and Israel. Even when Jubilees deals with ideas that are associated with evil in other apocalypses, Jubilees always holds to a simple principle, “The Lord’s forces did everything that the Lord ordered them” (ወገብሩ ፡ ጎይላቲሁ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ዘመጠነ ፡ አዘዞሙ ፡ እግዚአብሔር, Jubilees 49:4). There are no cosmic forces outside God’s control.

This section focuses on the significance of angels and demons with respect to the presence of evil. The five sub-sections will span three time periods, over which angels and demons decrease in significance, approaching zero. The three chronological categories important for this issue in Jubilees are: before the flood, after the division of the nations, and the eschatological sequence.

#### 5.1.1. Before the flood: the origin of evil

Jubilees draws from the Book of the Watchers in interpreting Genesis, and manipulates the details to convey its own view of the origin of evil. Consequently, the Book of the Watchers will be particularly important in this section, but we are ultimately concerned with the view of the origin of evil in the apocalyptic worldview generally. The genre “apocalypse” and the apocalyptic worldview are not tied to a particular narrative on the origin of sin, and a variety of emphases can be found even within the Enochic literature. Without referring to the descent of the watchers, Daniel just as strongly uses the genre “apocalypse” to convey a non-human origin of evil. The apocalyptic worldview, through a variety of narratives, understands the origin of evil in terms other than the divine or human will. Jubilees differs not only in the narrative details of the Book of the Watchers, but in the general view of evil typically shared by the early apocalypses.

##### 5.1.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses

In the Book of the Watchers (BW) evil begins as a rebellion in heaven that is subsequently imposed onto earthly affairs. At most, the angels differ from other forms of pre-existent forces of chaos at enmity with God in that they presumably had good standing in heaven previously.<sup>5</sup> One might even read BW 15:7, “therefore I did not make women among you,” to indicate that God had created the watchers. Even so, the watchers are introduced in the story as willful rebels with no particular emphasis on a good origin

---

<sup>5</sup> According to BW 9:7 God had previously given authority to Shemihazah.

or nature. More importantly, the rebellion occurred in heaven, not on earth. The sin is not an error but a willful revolt. Shemihazah knows he “shall be guilty of a great sin” and pursues it anyway (BW 6:3). Asael, likewise, never had a benevolent mission, but learned a “stolen mystery” that is responsible for all the evils on the earth (BW 16:3; 10:8).

Like Jubilees, the Book of the Watchers mentions Adam and Eve, but not as an etiology of evil (BW 32:6; Jubilees 3:17-31). Readers influenced by Paul and Augustine may have trouble understanding Genesis 3 as other than an explanation of “original sin,” but that seems not to have been the case before our era.<sup>6</sup> The moderating factor of human responsibility in the Book of the Watchers comes rather in the extent to which angelic sin and punishment is typological for human (particularly priestly) sin and punishment.<sup>7</sup> Evil comes from without, but we should avoid the exaggeration that the Book of the Watchers or the early apocalyptic worldview leaves no room for human responsibility for participation in evil.

Scholars differ as to the extent to which the understanding of the origin of evil in the Book of the Watchers is implicit in other Enochic apocalypses. Although Paolo Sacchi understood this as the foundational idea of Enochic and apocalyptic literature,<sup>8</sup> it does seem that the position in the Book of the Watchers was moderated in other apocalypses.<sup>9</sup> In 1 Enoch 80:6, found in the Astronomical Book, the stars go astray first,

---

<sup>6</sup> Gary A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 209-210.

<sup>7</sup> See especially, Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 575-600. Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,” 115-135.

<sup>8</sup> Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 107.

<sup>9</sup> Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 73-74.

“Many heads of the stars will stray from the command and will change their ways and actions and will not appear at the times prescribed for them.”<sup>10</sup> The Animal Apocalypse alludes to the tradition of the fall of the watchers in 86:1, but develops the apocalyptic view of evil less in terms of primordial origins and more in terms of the subsequent amplification of evil. Human responsibility appears in the background, as in 89:54, but the climax in the author’s present is explained by cosmic agents.

If we were to expand our chronological scope to the Epistle of Enoch (other than the Apocalypse of Weeks)<sup>11</sup> we would find a significant development from the worldview of the early apocalypses, although not as significant as might first appear.<sup>12</sup> The main difference is that cosmic good and evil are translated into human society, but an ontological division between the righteous and the wicked remains. This view of evil is as much a contiguous development of the early apocalyptic worldview as it is a reform. It is still the case that suffering is imposed on the righteous from without, apart from the will of God or any just punishment. It is still the case that divine sovereignty is impeded in the present, and vindication and justice exist beyond this life. In particular, 98:4 has drawn attention as a qualification or reform of the Book of the Watchers. Although the verse is textually difficult, the sense is clear enough that human sin is not excused by supernatural imposition. The Book of the Watchers did not say humans have no

---

<sup>10</sup> James C. VanderKam and George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A New Translation, Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

<sup>11</sup> Nickelsburg sets a relative date for the Epistle after Jubilees. Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 427.

<sup>12</sup> Consider alternatively Paolo Sacchi’s account of the relationship between the Epistle of Enoch and the Book of the Watchers. Sacchi views the Epistle as direct and “conscious opposition.” Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 146.



responsibility for their actions, and the Epistle does not diverge from a view of evil as imposed from without. Even if the trajectory culminating in the Epistle of Enoch existed at the time of Jubilees, it still fits as a reform within the cluster of the apocalyptic worldview.

#### 5.1.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses

Daniel provides the clearest example of a view of the origin of evil that is independent of the Book of the Watchers and yet aligns on the more abstract level of worldview. Daniel does not narrate an explanation of the origin of evil *per se*, but uses imagery that reflects a worldview of evil arising and acting, independent of human sin and divine will. The beasts in Daniel 7 come neither from heaven nor humanity, but arise from the sea, evoking the ancient images of the rivals of God, Yamm and Leviathan. Although the second beast is told, “Arise, devour much flesh,” (7:5, קוּמִי אֲכָלִי בֶּשֶׂר שָׂגִיא), this does not suggest that the beasts arise at the command of God to chastise sin. The beasts are not fallen angels, but certainly not human. Daniel’s prayer in Daniel 9 assumes Israel’s responsibility for its own suffering, but the revealed explanation differs in asserting an external source of evil and a resolution independent of human repentance or other action. The prince of the kingdom of Persia in Daniel 10:13 acts in independent opposition to God and Israel. The “little horn” is more complex in that a human figure is partly signified, but the apocalyptic view focuses on the cosmic forces of evil behind the human façade. The actions attributed to the horn in 8:10-25 and 11:36 are not merely human. Jewish thinkers could agree that God’s victory and sovereignty are *ultimately* assured, and that humans are ultimately responsible for their role in sin. The apocalyptic

worldview is distinctive in the view that evil exists outside the will of God for the chastisement of human sin, and can temporarily impede divine justice.

#### 5.1.1.3. Jubilees

Jubilees bears a resemblance to the Book of the Watchers in the interpretation of Genesis 6, but modifies details and undermines the broader implications of the apocalyptic view of the origin of evil.<sup>13</sup> Jubilees emphasizes that the watchers were created by God. In 2:2, Jubilees interprets the first day of creation to include creation of all the spirits who serve before God. Jubilees introduces the watchers as creatures of God, while the Book of the Watchers introduces them as willful rebels, if not necessarily pre-existent forces of cosmic opposition. Jubilees emphasizes that the watchers were sent by God with a good mission (4:15; 5:6), and essentially err by getting into bad marriages. Although intermarriage was not a light matter to the author of Jubilees, and inappropriate priestly marriages have been found to resonate behind the Book of the Watchers,<sup>14</sup> we should recognize the difference between earthly lust and a cosmic rebellion imposed onto human affairs.<sup>15</sup>

One can also see the contrasting emphasis on culpability in the function of Enoch's testimony in the Book of the Watchers and Jubilees. In the Book of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Some of these ideas appeared already in Hanneken, "Angels and Demons," 11-25.

<sup>14</sup> See note 7.

<sup>15</sup> Recently, Segal has argued convincingly that the separation of the descent of the watchers from the sin of the watchers meets a chronological need to place the descent in the days of Jared but the sin at 120 years before the flood. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 132. This probably is the best explanation of the primary motivation. Nevertheless, in light of the larger pattern, it is still worth considering the motivation of moving sin from the cosmic realm to the human realm, if only as a secondary benefit of the solution.

Watchers, Enoch's main function is to testify against the watchers (12:4—13:3; 16:2-4).

Nothing is said of human sin or the “wives” of the watchers.<sup>16</sup> Jubilees does mention once that Enoch had testified to the watchers (4:22), but emphasizes that Enoch's primary role is to testify to humankind.

ወናሁ : ውእቱ : በህየ : ይጽሕፍ : ደይነ : ወኩነኔ : ዓለም : ወኩሎ :  
እከዮሙ : ለደቂቀ : እንሰ : እመሕያው ::

[JCVK] Now he [Enoch] is there [Eden, not heaven] writing down the judgment and condemnation of the world and all the wickedness of *mankind*. (Jubilees 4:23, emphasis added; likewise 4:19)

The case of the exogamous watchers is useful as a paradigm for human exogamy, but it is a closed case with, as we shall see, no lasting effects on Israel.<sup>17</sup> The sin of the watchers is deemphasized but not eliminated; it is recycled as an example of sin, not an etiology of sin.<sup>18</sup>

The good mission of the watchers in Jubilees brings us to the issue of angelic instruction, a point on which Jubilees inverts a basic theme in the Book of the Watchers and paints a picture of the cosmos that differs from the contemporary apocalypses.

---

<sup>16</sup> For textual difficulties in the Book of the Watchers 19:2, and the implications of the fate of the women for their culpability, see Kelley Coblenz Bautch, “What Becomes of the Angels’ ‘Wives’? A Text-Critical Study of 1 Enoch 19:2,” *JBL* 125, no. 4 (2006): 766-780. See also the Testament of Reuben 5:6, which blames the women for seducing the watchers.

<sup>17</sup> A similar conclusion was arrived at independently by Segal, “The Watchers story has been transformed into a paradigm of reward and punishment, and the presentation of God as a just, righteous judge.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 140. See further page 396 below.

<sup>18</sup> James C. VanderKam, “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick, and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 170. For a different but compatible analysis see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.,” in *The Fall of the Angels*, ed. Christoph Auffarth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, Themes in Biblical Narrative 6 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 111-115. Likewise, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

Jubilees introduces angelic instruction as licit and righteous, in contrast to the illicit instruction of a stolen mystery.

**ወረዱ ፡ መላእክተ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ውስተ ፡ ምድር ፡ እለ ፡ ተሰምዩ ፡ ትጉሃኑ ፡  
ከመ ፡ ይምህርዎሙ ፡ ለደቂቀ ፡ እንለ ፡ እመሕያው ፡ ወይግበሩ ፡ ፍትሐ ፡  
ወርትዐ ፡ በዲበ ፡ ምድር ።**

[JCVK] The angels of the Lord who were called Watchers descended to earth to teach mankind and to do what is just and upright upon the earth.  
(Jubilees 4:15)

Jubilees does not abandon the motif of illicit instruction, however, but transfers it to after the division of the nations. As we shall see in the next sub-section, Jubilees’ twist on the apocalyptic view of evil is not so much to deny the existence of evil, but to limit its domain to the gentiles. Thus, Jubilees never mentions illicit teaching of the watchers as a source of sin or suffering until Noah’s great-grandson Kainan finds an inscription teaching bad astronomy (Jubilees 8:3). Jubilees transfers the idea of illicit teaching from a cosmic rebellion that corrupts the earth from without, to an explanation of foreign astronomy. The adaptation of the illicit teaching motif in Jubilees is striking not only in how the details diverge from the Book of the Watchers, but especially in light of the fact that Jubilees otherwise presents angels as mindless transmitters of licit teaching.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> The twist on the motif of angelic instruction in the Book of the Watchers is symptomatic of a general fundamental difference between the Book of Jubilees and the apocalypses. As we shall continue to see, the apocalypses often portray even good angels as relatively fallible independent entities, both in instruction and otherwise. With the possible but otherwise explicable exception of Kainan’s inscription, angels in Jubilees always obey orders. This is also true of Mastema, as we shall see below, but a few passages pertain to teaching in particular. Jubilees 6:35 emphasizes that the revealing angel adds nothing independently, “For I know and from now on will inform you—not from my own mind because this is the way the book is written in front of me, and the divisions of times are ordained on the heavenly tablets...” (Jubilees 6:35; እስመ ፡ አአምር ፡ አነ ። ወእምይእዜ ፡ አነ ፡ አየድዐክ ፡ ወአኮ ፡ እምልብየ ፡ እስመ ፡ ከመዝ ፡ ወጽሐፍ ፡ ጽሐፍ ፡ ቅድሜየ ፡ ወተሠርዐ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ጽላተ ፡ ሰማይ ። ከፋሌሁ ፡ ለመዋዕል ።). Again, 12:22 emphasizes that the revealing angel is merely a conduit, “the word of the Lord was sent to him through me” (ወናሁ ፡ ቃለ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ተፈነወ ፡ ንቤሁ ፡ በእዴየ). It may at first appear that Jubilees participates in a pattern of understanding theophanies as angelic visitations in order to maintain divine transcendence, but the situation is not quite so simple. In some cases, Jubilees adds the presence of angels where it is not explicit in Genesis (Jubilees 16:1 introduces angels, perhaps to add consistency to Genesis 18:1-2, “The

The apocalypses typically paint human sin and suffering in the shadow of cosmic evil. Even before the flood, Jubilees paints a different picture of the origin and nature of evil. The dramatic contrast, however, comes after the division of the nations. Jubilees does not deny the existence of evil or super-human agency, but it does claim that demons and their afflictions are assigned exclusively to gentiles. The apocalyptic view of evil is accurate for gentiles, but for Israel under the covenant it could not be more wrong.

#### 5.1.2. After the flood: the persistence of demons

Jubilees departs from the apocalyptic worldview most subtly in the period before the flood. Jubilees departs most radically in denying angels and demons any role in the eschatological climax and restoration, such as it is in Jubilees. In the period between the flood and the eschaton Jubilees makes use of three features of the apocalypses in atypical ways. In this sub-section we consider the role of demons in the apocalypses, and Jubilees' innovations in asserting immunity for Israel and incorporating demons under the will of God. The next two sub-sections will consider the related issues of angelic mediation and the leader of evil. It continues to be the case that "the Lord's forces do all that the Lord

---

Lord appeared... he saw three men."). In other cases where Genesis indicates that an angel spoke, Jubilees adds that the angel spoke the words of God (Genesis 22:11 || Jubilees 18:9, 14). Often enough, a theophany in Genesis appears in Jubilees with no addition or removal of angels (Jubilees 14:1; 15:3; 24:9; 24:22; 44:5 || Genesis 15:1; 17:1; 26:2; 26:24; 46:24). At Jubilees 32:20 an angel follows up on a vision of God to fill in detail and answer any questions (based on the theophany in Genesis 35:9 but presumably influenced by the wrestler in Genesis 32). On two occasions something like a revelation is described without reference to angels ("spirit of righteousness" 25:15; "spirit of prophecy" 31:12). In the Babel account the angels are present as in Genesis, but any hint of an independent voice or action is excised. Angels tutor Abram in Hebrew (Jubilees 12:25-27) and supervise Noah's division of the earth (in Jubilees 8:10, 20 the angel frames and authorizes the allotment to Shem by placing "the word of the Lord in [Noah's] mouth."). For more analysis of angelic instruction in Jubilees, see Reed, "Angels, Demons, and the Dangerous Ones in Between," forthcoming.

commanded them,” and evil has no sovereignty, even temporarily, outside the divine will. Jubilees twists the apocalyptic view of evil forces by saying that it is only true for the other nations and those of Israel who join them.

#### 5.1.2.1. The early apocalypses

Demons, *per se*, do not appear in all the apocalypses, nor are they limited to the apocalypses (e.g. Tobit). They are, however, a convenient way of expressing the apocalyptic worldview that humanity is afflicted by supernatural evil that cannot be explained as just chastisement from God in proportion to sinfulness. Again, the details of the treatment in Jubilees most resemble the Book of the Watchers, but the implications extend to the worldview shared by the Book of the Watchers, Daniel, the Animal Apocalypse, and so forth. In the typical apocalypses, whether by way of demons, beasts, or ineffective angels, Israel experiences unjust suffering as a result of external evil. All Jewish sources at the time could agree that God’s superiority and ultimate victory were assured, and that human action could have some significance. Jubilees is distinctive among the apocalypses, however, in denying that God’s just sovereignty is suspended or seriously challenged. Demons and affliction are the divine plan for the gentiles, but Israel is immune simply by staying away from the gentiles. In order to match the worldview of Jubilees, Daniel would have to say that the beasts afflict all nations except Israel, or that God sent the little horn to mislead the gentiles from converting to Judaism.

#### 5.1.2.2. Jubilees

Jubilees follows the Book of the Watchers on the basic idea of the existence and origin of demons.<sup>20</sup> In the Book of the Watchers the demons continue to afflict the righteous unchecked until the final judgment (BW 15:8—16:1). Jubilees, on the other hand, is unique among the apocalypses in asserting a ninety percent reduction in the number of demons (Jubilees 10:9).<sup>21</sup> In numbers alone Jubilees deemphasizes demons. We shall return below to the role of Mastema in this account, but we can say here that the ten percent who remain do so at the will of God. Furthermore, Jubilees shifts the role of demons from capricious affliction of the innocent to a form of divine justice, “because great is the evil of humanity” (እስመ : ዐቢይ : እኩዮሙ : ለውሉድ : ሰብእ; Jubilees 10:8). More strikingly, the affliction of the nations is not punishment in the Deuteronomic sense of prompting repentance, but part of the divine plan to lead astray all nations except Israel (Jubilees 15:31). Jubilees develops an idea that is already found in the ancient versions of Psalms 96:5 and 106:35 that other gods and whatever power may be perceived in other religions are simply demons (Jubilees 1:11; 11:4).<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Michel Testuz has pointed out that Jubilees does not make it perfectly clear that the demons are the spirits of the giants, rather than the half-brothers of the giants, but it does seem likely enough that Jubilees assumes the explanation of the Book of the Watchers that the children of the watchers are giants while they live and persist as demons after their bodies are slaughtered. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 83.

<sup>21</sup> On a related matter, apocalypses sometimes suggest that corruption and sin perseveres not only in demons but within humanity as some kind of genetic defect. These texts look forward to the establishment of a “new and righteous nature” for humanity (perhaps drawing from Ezekiel 36:26, etc.). In Jubilees 5:12, it has already happened. Segal also notes that the day of judgment and new creation in the Book of the Watchers is eschatological, whereas in Jubilees 5:10-12 it refers to the flood. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 137, 139.

<sup>22</sup> VanderKam, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” 354.

Jubilees establishes that observance of the covenant grants Israel immunity from the demons with two details. First, Noah receives revelation and writes books that provide immunity from demons. This notion seems to have inspired the later idea of a medical book, likely in the pattern of competitive historiography, ultimately influencing the Book of Asaph the Physician.<sup>23</sup> Although it may be the case, as a number of scholars believe, that the author of Jubilees had in mind an actual collection of writings attributed to Noah,<sup>24</sup> the mention in Jubilees can be explained within the literary motif of ancestral books. Jubilees ultimately aims to assert that the Levites came into sole possession of all the legitimate writings of the ancestors (Jubilees 45:16). More importantly, as discussed in the chapter on revelation, the heavenly tablets existed from creation and were gradually revealed, but they contain nothing that is not revealed to Moses at Sinai. Thus, the Books of Noah anticipate typologically the Torah of Moses.<sup>25</sup> The important point is that the study of revealed books grants immunity from demons (Jubilees 10:13). In the days before photocopiers, Jubilees emphasizes that these books were transmitted only to Shem and ultimately only to Levi. In the context of the continuation, it is impossible that

---

<sup>23</sup> See Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees*," 115-141. Elinor Lieber, "Asaf's 'Book of Medicines': A Hebrew Encyclopedia of Greek and Jewish Medicine, Possibly Compiled in Byzantium on an Indian Model," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 38 (1984): 233-249. Jellinek, "ספר נח," 155-160.

<sup>24</sup> The idea of a "Book of Noah" appears a number of times in antiquity. Although scholars disagree as to whether the burden of proof is to prove or disprove the existence of an actual book behind these references, it can at least be agreed that no one coherent composition is likely to account for all the contents attributed to such a book. The ancients may not have shared our concern for the lines between imagining Noah as a scribal figure, actually composing works from Noah's point of view, and compiling and standardizing a collection that can be called *The Book of Noah*. It does not seem likely to me that a single standard Book of Noah existed, but it is clear that Noah was imagined as a scribe, and composition from Noah's point of view is hardly unlikely. For bibliography and a sound discussion leading to a slightly different conclusion, see Michael E. Stone, "The Book(s) Attributed to Noah," *DSD* 13, no. 1 (2006): 4-23.

<sup>25</sup> Jubilees maintains that Moses renews and completes the covenant that had existed previously (Jubilees 6:18-19; 14:20). See also 7.7 below.



any nations besides Israel (and further, any authority besides the Levites), has books of revealed knowledge that grant immunity from demons. The “medicine” foreshadows study and observance of the law, which appears again as the means to guarantee quality and length of life (Jubilees 23:26).

Second, although demons have the potential function of punishing sin, Israel alone has the means of forgiveness of sin. As long as Israel obeys the covenant and separates from the nations they are immune in the first place, but even if they do sin they have the unique opportunity to be forgiven through the Day of Atonement (Jubilees 5:17-18). Similarly, proper observance of the Passover does not merely remove any accumulated guilt, but functions preemptively to keep away any plagues for the coming year (Jubilees 49:15). Thus, for Jubilees, the apocalyptic view of affliction by evil forces, and demons in particular, is not false, but it is only true of other nations.<sup>26</sup> Demons do exist as an explanation for whatever power may be perceived in foreign religion, and they do serve to warn those of Israel who may be tempted to stray from endogamy, separation, and piety under the traditional authorities in Jerusalem. They also function to explain affliction in biblical Israel that might otherwise be attributed to God. This aspect will be addressed below in connection with Mastema. Even when governed by Mastema, the demons only afflict sinners and only with divine permission. The fact that demons are apportioned to some but not all of Noah’s children explains why Jubilees does not address the origin of the demons from the slain giants in the narrative sequence before the flood, but only after the flood and the apportionment of lots to Noah’s descendents

---

<sup>26</sup> One might wonder if this implies a perspective that the apocalyptic worldview is non-native or overly influenced by foreign ideas.

(Jubilees 10:1).<sup>27</sup> Israel's immunity from cosmic evil, or cosmic fallibility of any kind, even temporarily, is guaranteed not only by the books of the covenant and the festivals, but by the next point, the uninterrupted and unmediated governance of Israel by God.

### 5.1.3. Angelic mediation

We have ample evidence that around and before the time of Jubilees a diversity of thought existed in Judaism on the issue of angelic governance. It may not be the case that *only* apocalypses understand God's sovereignty as temporarily mediated by imperfect angels, but it is the case that several apocalypses emphasize this view, and that Jubilees is the only apocalypse that emphatically rejects it. Again, none of the perspectives denies that God will *ultimately* be victorious or that good and powerful angels exist to bring about justice at the proper time. The apocalyptic worldview is that unjust suffering exists in Israel temporarily while angelic sovereigns over Israel are either wicked themselves or matched by their wicked opponents.

#### 5.1.3.1. Evidence outside the apocalypses

Before coming to the apocalypses, we should note some external traces of this issue in antiquity. We will not resolve indirectly related questions such as the date, priority, or mechanism of exegetical variation. The best known case of the issue of

---

<sup>27</sup> Hanneken, "Angels and Demons," 18.

angelic mediation appearing in variant texts is at Deuteronomy 32:8. Here the Masoretic text, in agreement with the Samaritan Pentateuch, gives,

בְּהַנְחִיל עֲלֵיוֹן גּוֹיִם בְּהַפְרִידוֹ בְּנֵי אָדָם יֵצֵב גְּבֻלַּת עַמִּים לְמִסְפָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

The Septuagint, however, suggests a *Vorlage* of בני אלהים, which is supported by 4QDeut<sup>j</sup> (בני אלוהים, column 12 line 14),<sup>28</sup>

ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὑψίστος ἔθνη, ὥς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ  
ἔστησεν ὅρια ἔθνων κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan reflects knowledge of both readings,

באחסנות עילאה עלמא לעממיא די נפקו מבנוי דנח באפרשותיה מכתבין ולישנין  
לבני־נשא בדרא דפלגותא בי היא זימנא רמא פיצתא עם שובעין מלאכיא רברבי  
עממין דאתגלי עימהון למחמי קרתא ובי היא זימנא אקים תחומי אומיא כסכום מניין  
שובעין נפשתא דישראל דנחתו למצרים

The significance of these variants has already been established.<sup>29</sup> In Deuteronomy 32:8 the issue is not explicitly whether Israel is apportioned to a minor divinity, but whether nations in general are so proportioned. Deuteronomy 29:25 (both MT and LXX) supports the idea that other nations are apportioned to other divine beings, but Israel is apportioned (directly) to God.

וַיִּלְכּוּ וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִדְעוּם וְלֹא חָלַק לָהֶם:

καὶ πορευθέντες ἐλάτρευσαν θεοῖς ἑτέροις καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτοῖς  
οἷς οὐκ ἠπίσταντο οὐδὲ διένειμεν αὐτοῖς· (Deuteronomy 29:25; see  
also 4:19)

Our principal concern is not which is original or whether the variant is more the cause or more the consequence of the disputed issue, but that a diversity of views existed.

<sup>28</sup> Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, *Qumran Cave 4*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, et al., vol. 9 Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings, DJD 14 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 90.

<sup>29</sup> See especially, VanderKam, "The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*," 352-354. See also, Russell, *Method & Message*, 248.

The interpretation of Third Isaiah often stands behind differences between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. Thus, it is entirely fitting to consider also a similar case in the text of Isaiah 63:9, although we are claiming a connection only as analogy, not cause. Here the difference is found in the *qere* and *ketiv* of the Masoretic text. The Masoretic *qere* and verse division disagree with the *ketiv* and the LXX. Line breaks are added below according to the simple sense of the consonantal text,<sup>30</sup> the LXX, and the Masoretic text.<sup>31</sup>

ויאמר אך עמי המה  
בנים לא ישקרו  
ויהי להם למושיע  
בכל צרתם  
לא צר ומלאך  
פניו הושיעם  
באהבתו ובחמלתו  
הוא גאלם  
וינטלם וינשאם  
כל ימי עולם

καὶ εἶπεν Οὐχ ὁ λαός μου  
τέκνα οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσωσιν;  
καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν  
ἐκ πάσης θλίψεως.  
οὐ πρέσβυς οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, (לא ציר ומלאך)<sup>32</sup>  
ἀλλ' αὐτὸς κύριος ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς  
διὰ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτοὺς καὶ φείδεσθαι αὐτῶν·  
αὐτὸς ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς  
καὶ ἀνέλαβεν αὐτοὺς  
καὶ ὕψωσεν αὐτοὺς  
πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος.

<sup>30</sup> Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 81.

<sup>31</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> presents expected and minor variations (plene orthography, באהבתו, ובחומלתו, last two verbs transposed).

<sup>32</sup> Isac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 62.

[margin: לֹא]

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהֵי הַמָּה  
בְּנִים לֹא יִשְׁקָרוּ  
וַיְהִי לָהֶם לְמוֹשִׁיעַ:  
בְּכָל־צָרָתָם | לֹא צָר  
וּמִלֶּאךָ פָּנָיו הוֹשִׁיעֵם  
בְּאַהֲבָתוֹ וּבְחַמְלָתוֹ  
הוּא גֹאֲלָם  
וַיִּנְטֹלֵם וַיַּנְשָׂאֵם  
כָּל־יְמֵי עוֹלָם:

The issue seems to go back to Exodus, which includes different images of who led Israel: an angel (מַלְאֲכֵי הַהֲלִיץ לְפָנֵי מַחֲנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל) in 14:19,<sup>33</sup> or God directly (פָּנֵי יְלֹכֹוּ) in 33:14-15. The issue in the variants of Isaiah 63:9 is whether salvation can be attributed to an angel of the presence. Whereas the LXX reflects a negative valuation of an angelic mediator of divine salvation (“Neither an envoy nor an angel, but the Lord himself”), the Masoretes either accept or prefer the idea of a faithful angelic agent of a transcendent God (“His angel of the presence”).

One more external witness reflects the same concern, in a more certain historical and social context. The Hebrew base of Sirach can be easily dated to the first quarter of the second century BCE, and even if one suspected liberties in translation on behalf of the grandson, one can still be sure of a chronological proximity to Jubilees. I do not claim a close alignment of Jubilees and Sirach, but it does help that the relationship between Sirach and the apocalypses has been studied thoroughly.<sup>34</sup> By all accounts the worldview

---

<sup>33</sup> Likewise Numbers 20:16. Jubilees 48:13 assigns a role to the angel of the presence while maintaining, “The Lord brought them out....” See Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 217 n. 41.

<sup>34</sup> I favor Argall’s characterization as rivalry, but others have described the situation as indirect polemic (Wright) or direct polemic (Boccaccini and Olyan). Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 250. Benjamin G. Wright, “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’: Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood,” in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*, ed. Pancratius C. Beentjes (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 220. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 80. Saul M. Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 279-280.

of Sirach in general differs from that of the apocalypses. The difference holds for the issue at hand, as Sirach makes clear in 17:17,<sup>35</sup>

ἐκάστω ἔθνει κατέστησεν ἡγούμενον, καὶ μερὶς κυρίου Ἰσραηλ ἐστίν

To every nation he appointed a ruler, but Israel is the portion of the Lord.  
(Sirach 17:17)

Although the parallel with Deuteronomy 32:8 is unmistakable, the context does not suggest that the author is simply following a version of Deuteronomy. Rather, the context confirms that Sirach is concerned with the issue at hand in its own right. God's governance over Israel, awareness of sin, and justice in punishment is never delayed, mediated, or obfuscated by angelic bureaucracy.<sup>36</sup>

#### 5.1.3.2. The early apocalypses

We find the same issue, but a different perspective, in several early apocalypses. The Animal Apocalypse provides the most detailed account, but the Book of the Watchers and Daniel convey the same basic worldview. Here the issue is not the wickedness of the wicked angels, although we do find more of these in the Animal Apocalypse, but the inefficiency of the relatively good angels. The implication seems to be that God would never tolerate the present state of injustice, so some kink in the system

---

<sup>35</sup> The Hebrew manuscripts do not preserve this verse. Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VTSup 68 (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997).

<sup>36</sup> This sample hardly exhausts the relevant sources. One could continue by considering the role of angels as executioners (Ex 12:23; Gen 18), or intercessors (Zech 1:12; Job 33:23). The idea of wicked angels as patrons of wicked kings and kingdoms appears in Isaiah 24:21ff. The Epistle of Enoch 100:5 refers to the angelic guardian of the righteous. Michael serves as a mediator in the Testament of Dan 6:2 (cf. 1 Timothy 2:5). Angels fill a priestly function in the Testament of Levi 3:5.

must explain the present while maintaining the ultimate justice and supremacy of God. The Animal Apocalypse develops an idea like the one in Deuteronomy 32:8 to the conclusion that rule over Israel has been outsourced to seventy angels, which are homologous with seventy nations (Animal Apocalypse 89:59). These angels degrade from mean to evil. The idea that God would outsource sovereignty over Israel is at odds with the perspective already seen in Sirach and soon to be seen in Jubilees. This by itself, however, is only part of the problem. According to the Animal Apocalypse, Israel does have its own guardian apart from the blind and wicked angels. Israel's angel is good, but nevertheless limited as an intermediary and presently powerless, except to take detailed notes for the sake of justice in the future (Animal Apocalypse 89:71).

Likewise in the Book of the Watchers, one does find wicked angels, as already discussed with respect to the origin of evil, but the further issue is that even the good angels are basically bureaucrats, receiving complaints and compiling reports with considerable delay (Book of the Watchers 9:1-4). The issue is not whether Michael is good or bad, but whether any angel, rather than God directly, is in charge of the chosen people (BW 20:15). Again in Daniel, the first part of the issue is the fact that the holy ones are left at the mercy of a beast for a certain period (Daniel 7:25). The second part is that even the good angels are at the limit of their means to keep evil in check. Again, God's ultimate victory is certain, but the myriad myriads of God's power are reserved for the future (Daniel 7:10). As of 10:21 the forces of good number two, וְאֵין אֶחָד מִתְחַזֵּק עִמִּי (see also Daniel 12:1). Regardless of variations in the narrative details, the apocalyptic worldview clusters tightly around the view that God's sovereignty is temporarily impeded both by the wickedness of some cosmic forces, and the inefficiency or inefficacy of the good cosmic forces.

### 5.1.3.3. Jubilees

Jubilees conveys a different view. We should avoid two exaggerations. First, it is not the case that Jubilees is obsessed with this issue; it is a long book and several comments to this effect do not mean it is a primary concern. Also, it is not necessarily the case that Jubilees is engaging in direct polemic; the relevant comments are spread out in the book and there is no particular section where Jubilees sustains an assault on the apocalyptic worldview on this or related issues. Far from these two exaggerations, we can still say confidently that Jubilees conveys a worldview that differs significantly from the worldview typically conveyed by the genre “apocalypse.” Furthermore, it is precisely in using the typical features of apocalypses that it expresses this different view, either inserting a “not” or saying it is true of other nations but not Israel.

The clearest example appears in Jubilees 15:31-32. Here, Jubilees follows apocalypses in addressing the issue of angelic princes over nations, but denies their view of the relevance of these spirits for Israel. They never rule over Israel, God’s sovereignty is direct and absolute, and the misleading that the angels do against other nations they do at the command of God.

ወቀደሶ ፡ ወአስተጋብአ ፡ እምኩሉ ፡ ውሉደ ፡ ሰብእ ፡ ። እስመ ፡ ብዙኅ ፡  
አሕዛብ ፡ ወብዙኅ ፡ ሕዝብ ፡ ወኩሉ ፡ ሎቱ ፡ ወዲበ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ አስለጠ ፡  
መናፍስተ ፡ ከመ ፡ ያስሕቶሙ ፡ እምድኅሬሁ ፡ ወዲበ ፡ እስራኤል ፡  
ኢያስለጠ ፡ ወኢመነሂ ፡ መልአክ ፡ ወመንፈሰ ፡ ። እስመ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ባሕቲቱ ፡  
መኩንኖሙ ፡ ወውእቱ ፡ የዐቅቦሙ ፡ ወይትኅሠሦሙ ፡ እምእደ ፡  
መላእክቲሁ ፡ ወእምነ ፡ መናፍስቲሁ ፡ ወእምእደ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ወኩሉ ፡  
ትእዛዛቲሁ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይዕቀቦሙ ፡ ወይባርኮሙ ፡ ወይኩንዎ ፡ ሎቱ ፡  
ወውእቱ ፡ ይኩኖሙ ፡ ሎሙ ፡ እምይእዜ ፡ ወእስክ ፡ ለዓለም ፡ ።

[JCVK] He sanctified them and gathered (them) from all mankind. For there are many nations and many peoples and all belong to him. He made spirits rule over all in order to lead them astray from following him. But over Israel he made no angel or spirit rule because he alone is their ruler.



He will guard them and require them for himself from his angels, his spirits, and everyone, and all his powers so that he may guard them and bless them and so that they may be his and he theirs from now and forever.  
(Jubilees 15:31-32)

As we shall continue to see, Mastema and the demons are indistinct from other angels in the divine commission to lead astray the gentiles (Jubilees 10:3, 8; 12:20; 19:28). The lack of outsourcing of sovereignty over Israel is reinforced in Jubilees 16:17-18 and 19:28-29 (see also 21:20).<sup>37</sup>

**ወእምነ : ውሉደ : ይስሐቅሂ : አሐዱ : ይከውን : ለዘርእ : ቅዱስ : ወውስተ :  
አሕዛብኒ : አይትኃለቀኑ :: እስመ : ለመክፈልተ : ልዑል : ይከውን :  
ወውስተ : ዘይመልክ : አምላክ : ወረደ : ኩሉ : ዘርኡ : ከመ : ይኩን :  
ለእግዚአብሔር : ሕዝበ : ትርሲት : እምኩሉ : ሕዝብ**

[JCVK] 16:17 ... But one of Isaac's sons would become a holy progeny and would not be numbered among the nations, 16:18 for he would become the share of the Most High. All his descendants had fallen into that (share) which God owns so that they would become a people whom the Lord *possesses* out of all the nations... (Jubilees 16:17-18)

**ወይኩንክ : እግዚአብሔር : አምላክ : አበ : ወአንተሂ : ወልደ : በኩረ :  
ወለሕዝብ : ኩሎ : መዋእሶል ::**

[JCVK] May the Lord God become your father and you his first-born son and people for all time... (Jubilees 19:29)

In light of this pattern, there can be no doubt that “Jacob’s guardian” in Jubilees 35:17 is none other than God directly,

**ዐቃቢሁ : ለያዕቆብ : ዐቢይ : ወኅያል : ወክቡር : ወእኩት : እምዐቃቢሁ :  
ለዔሳው**

[JCVK] Jacob’s guardian is greater and more powerful, glorious, and praiseworthy than Esau’s guardian. (Jubilees 35:17)

כי שומר י<sup>ע</sup> [קנ] ב גדול וגבור [ונכבד מהולל משומר עיש] וא  
(4QpapJub<sup>h</sup> 2 II:11-12)

---

<sup>37</sup> The same basic perspective that God never abandons or outsources sovereignty over Israel appears in other passages, such as Jubilees 1:5-6, 18, which diverges from the parallel source in Deuteronomy 31:17 to make clear that God never abandons Israel, even as temporary punishment.

This is not to say that angels have no role in God's governance of the cosmos. In Jubilees 4:6 angels do report sin, but in context they are a foil for God's omniscience, not an explanation for how evil prospers under an inefficient cosmic judicial system. According to Jubilees there is no inefficiency or delay in God's just governance. The gentiles are misled at the command of God, but Israel is protected by keeping the covenant and simply by keeping their distance from the nations. Without explicitly referring to Deuteronomy 32:8, Isaiah 63:9, or Sirach 17:17, Jubilees clearly takes the position that angelic princes are assigned to other nations. They mislead, but not out of incompetence or infidelity; they only mislead the gentiles and they only do so at God's command. God deals with Israel directly, and whatever suffering they endure comes directly from God.

Thus far we have seen several ways in which Jubilees, unlike contemporary apocalypses, denies the relevance of evil or fallible cosmic forces for Israel. Now we come to the idea of a leader of evil forces against God, and how the figure of Mastema in Jubilees diverges on the level of worldview.

#### 5.1.4. The leader of evil

The history of religions approach to the figure of Satan has left a few impediments to understanding Mastema in the Book of Jubilees. First, there has been a tendency to approach the Satan myth as a single tradition articulated with many synonymous names and titles. It is worth paying attention to the significance of the choice of the term "Mastema" in Jubilees. Second, there has been a tendency to view this single tradition as a linear development from "primitive" to "advanced" ideas about Satan. Although it is certainly true that our discussion would look different if we

compared Mastema to the Satan of the Middle Ages, Jubilees cannot be explained as a different developmental stage of the same idea. Third, there has been a tendency to read early texts in light of later interpretations—indeed, it is difficult not to. Although the Book of the Watchers certainly influenced later accounts such as 2 Enoch 29-31, it is not the case in the Book of the Watchers that Shemihazah and Asael continue to rule over armies of evil. Similarly, the distinction between Satan and the antichrist nascent in the Apocalypse of John and soon expanded by interpreters cannot determine our categories when reading Daniel. Indeed, one cannot really say that the apocalyptic worldview at the time of Jubilees has a defined “Satan” figure, at least not without arguing from trajectory or apocalypses of ambiguous date. It is at least clear that contemporary apocalypses maintain a view of evil as a cosmic force apart from and in opposition to God. The figure of Mastema in Jubilees is one way in which Jubilees contradicts this view. In a broader chronological scope, the figure of Mastema in Jubilees is comparable to other traditions about a prince of demons, but when one compares on the level of worldview, one finds that Mastema in Jubilees contrasts significantly with the superficially similar figures.

#### 5.1.4.1. Terms, names and titles

Before describing what can be found in contemporary apocalypses, we should say a few words about the terms used in Jubilees and their relationship to the terms in received scripture. It has been questioned whether Mastema is even a name in Jubilees.<sup>38</sup> There is no doubt that Jubilees is referring to an individual figure with this term, but to

---

<sup>38</sup> VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 266.

the extent to which we can distinguish between a name, a title, and a description of a role, it seems unlikely that Mastema is a name or perhaps even a title. This is a subtle distinction, but worth noting. Josephus and the Essenes as such come later, but it is at least curious that Josephus tells us that the Essenes hold the names of the angels among their prized secret wisdom.<sup>39</sup> Contemporary apocalypses fit this trajectory,<sup>40</sup> whereas Jubilees, with the questionable exception of Mastema, names no angels.

Jubilees is not, in using the term “Mastema,” drawing directly on an earlier tradition that is known to us. The Qumran Jubilees fragments do not preserve the term *משטמה*, but the “Pseudo” Jubilees fragments and the Book of Asaph<sup>41</sup> do, making it likely that the term was used in the original composition of Jubilees. The fact that the translators transliterated this term is fortunate for us, but does not affect the discussion of whether it was originally a name or title. Prior to Jubilees, the term “Mastema” itself is known to us only from Hosea 9. I am able to find no connection between Hosea 9 and Jubilees. There is no evidence that the term in Hosea refers to a personal figure. The LXX, BDB, and several modern translations render respectively, *μᾶνία*, animosity, harassment, hostility, and hatred. The context in Hosea is days of punishment and requital, but if that is the connection, it is ironic, since Mastema plays no role in Jubilees 23 or related eschatological passages. If one looks more broadly for the root *שטם* one finds little help. It seems most likely that the choice of the term Mastema in Jubilees is governed by two factors. First, the word exists as a term for hostility, which does point

---

<sup>39</sup> *Bellum* 2.142.

<sup>40</sup> Daniel 8:16; 9:21; 10:13, 21; 12:1. Book of the Watchers 6:7; 9:1; 20:1-8; etc.

<sup>41</sup> See note 47 below.

the reader in the right direction. Second, the word resembles, but is not, *השטן*, which conjures the reader's knowledge of S/satan(s) without actually identifying Mastema as such.<sup>42</sup> The idea of this particular figure is conjured but the divergence is posted in the term itself. As we shall see, Jubilees has an agenda for the term "satans" apart from what is said about Mastema.

Before turning to the terms "Mastema," "satans," "beliar," and "Molech" in Jubilees, it will also be helpful to mention the attested usage of the term *משטמה* in and after Jubilees. Even though Jubilees was an influential document at Qumran and the term *משטמה* is attested in sectarian and probably non-sectarian works, it is never used unambiguously as a proper noun, and is often used unambiguously as a common noun.<sup>43</sup> To be sure, it could be part of a title or way of referring to a particular figure, and any use of the term would be suggestive at some level, but neither before nor after Jubilees was the term accepted as primarily a proper noun. At risk of belaboring a minor point and making too much of the distinction between a proper noun and a title or role, the same is true of Jubilees. The term almost always appears in construct with "prince." The term could easily be translated as "Harsh Prince," if one were more concerned with translating original meaning than conveying allusions and connections with the history of

---

<sup>42</sup> See below on Jubilees 10:11, which has been taken as identifying Mastema as Satan. Charles, *Jubilees*, 81.

<sup>43</sup> If one accepts that plural or possessive forms (*משטמתו*) are not proper nouns (regardless of allusiveness) then one eliminates 1QS 3.23; 4QCatena<sup>a</sup> 9.5; 4QBer<sup>a</sup>; and 4Q390. In other cases it is perfectly clear that Mastema/hostility is an attribute of Belial, not a separate figure (1QMilhamah 13.4, 11). In cases influenced by Jubilees, it remains as ambiguous as it is in Jubilees whether it is a name *per se*. As with Jubilees, it is used in construct with *שר* or *מלאך* in CD 16.5 and Pseudo-Jubilees. It might be somewhat surprising if a morphologically feminine form were used as a name for an angel (the last consonant of *שמחזה* is not a gender marker).

interpretation (I still prefer the latter).<sup>44</sup> None of this is to deny that this prince is a particular figure in Jubilees, or that this figure can be compared to the particular figures elsewhere referred to as Satan, the satan, or satans.

Although the two references to “Beliar” in Jubilees were once counted as evidence of a different source from that which used the term “Mastema,” it is not likely that these nouns refer to Mastema or any individual figure at all.<sup>45</sup> Just as בליעל is often used in received scripture, Jubilees uses the equivalent noun in two construct phrases in the senses, rendered by JPS (1985), “scoundrels” and “base thoughts” (Jubilees 1:20; 15:33; Deuteronomy 13:14; 15:9). In Jubilees 1:20 the phrase መንፈስ : ቤልሐር (unjust spirit, literally: spirit of Belial) is parallel to መንፈስ : ርቱዐ (just spirit, literally: spirit of righteousness). We should overcome associations from later developments, particularly in the War Scroll and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which put Belial in direct contrast with God as an independent rival figure. Jubilees also uses the term “Molech” in the common sense, but no one has suggested that this refers to an active agent in the cosmic drama (Jubilees 30:10).<sup>46</sup>

The word “satan” appears five times in the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees. Four of those are in nearly identical phrases, “there will be no satan or any evil one” አልቦ :

---

<sup>44</sup> Compare the decisions of Vermès and García-Martínez in translating “Angel of Persecution” and “angel Mastema” respectively in the context of the Jubilees citation in CD 16.5. Géza Vermès, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1997), 137. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden Brill, 1999), 565. Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: the Qumran Texts in English*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Leiden; New York; Grand Rapids: E.J. Brill; W.B. Eerdmans, 1996), 39.

<sup>45</sup> See above, page 130.

<sup>46</sup> Segal offers an excellent review of the meanings of “Belial.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 251-256. Segal concludes differently, however, that Belial is synonymous with Mastema in Jubilees. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, p. 182 n. 5, p. 253 n. 24, 28.

(መነሂ ፡) ሰይጣን ፡ ወአልቦ ፡ (መነሂ ፡) እኩዮ (Jubilees 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5). Two of these refer to an imagined future, but the other two refer to the peace and prosperity in Egypt under Joseph's governance. Notably, in all four of these instances, the term is indefinite, parallel with "any evil one," and negated (they are mentioned as *not* existing). It is expected for Ethiopic to use a singular noun with the negative ("not any satan," rather than, "not any satans"). In none of these cases is a supernatural sense required. The designation "satans" seems to be a general term for adversaries, likely including human as well as demonic troublemakers. Jubilees 10:11 refers to a figure "the satan" or "Satan," but this is easily corrected to "Mastema" on the basis of the Book of Asaph the Physician.<sup>47</sup> This work, though late, is clearly related to the Book of Jubilees (arguably from a common source, a dependant work, or Jubilees itself).<sup>48</sup> While a broader comparison would show even more strongly the close relationship, the relevant portion, aligned with the Ethiopic, is as follows,

אך אחד מעשרה הניח להתהלך בארץ לפני שר המשטמה

But he left a tenth to go about on the earth before the prince of Mastema.<sup>49</sup>

ወዐሥራቶሙ ፡ አትረፍነ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይኩንነ ፡ ቅድመ ፡ ሰይጣን ፡ ዲበ ፡ ምድር ፡፡

[JCVK] while we left a tenth of them to exercise power on the earth before the satan. (Jubilees 10:11)

---

<sup>47</sup> This work appears in Jellinek and is partially included by Charles in an appendix. Jellinek, "ספר נח," 155-160. Charles, *Jubilees*, 179.

<sup>48</sup> Himmelfarb doubts that the author knew the entire Book of Jubilees, but she perhaps underestimates other parallels. For example, she asserts, "None of the ills of *Jubilees* is unambiguously a physical ailment," but one could easily link illness and mortality to wickedness on the basis of Jubilees 23. Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees*," 130.

<sup>49</sup> Note that the redactor did not render מִשְׁטָמָה הַשֵּׁר, as might have been expected if it was understood as a proper noun (cf. at the beginning, Mt. Lubar, לִוְבֵּר הָהָר).

While the Greek and Ethiopic transmitters of Jubilees could easily, based on later associations, have confused “Satan” for “Mastema,” it is less likely that a medieval Jewish physician would have substituted “Mastema” for “Satan.” Even without recourse to the Hebrew Book of Asaph the Physician, an emendation would be easily justified. The context clearly refers to Mastema (thus, if 10:11 did read “Satan,” there would be no doubt that Jubilees identifies the two names as one figure). The fact that Jubilees uses “satans” differently in four other places makes clear that a transmitter, and not the author, made the identification. Thus we can say confidently that the original composition of Jubilees only used “satans” to refer to adversaries in the most general sense.<sup>50</sup>

#### 5.1.4.2. Satan in non-apocalypse received scriptures

Much has been written on the origins and development of the “Satan” tradition, of which only a narrow slice is relevant here.<sup>51</sup> Before reviewing contemporary apocalypses, we will consider the use of the term in received scripture. Even in a few references one finds a diversity of views. For a supernatural figure identified with the term one must examine Numbers 22, Job 1-2, Zechariah 3, 1 Chronicles 21:1, and perhaps Psalm 109:6.<sup>52</sup> In the last case, the indefinite noun could be taken as a human,

---

<sup>50</sup> Segal, however, reads Jubilees 10:11 with the Ethiopic and identifies Mastema with Satan. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 176 n. 19.

<sup>51</sup> Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977). Forsyth, *The Old Enemy*. Elaine Pagels, *The Origin of Satan* (New York: Random House, 1995). T. J. Wray and Gregory Mobley, *The Birth of Satan: Tracing the Devil's Biblical Roots* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005). Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

<sup>52</sup> The verbal root appears in several psalms in reference to human opponents. The indefinite noun refers to some human opponents in Samuel and Kings.



but in the context of the verb פקד and with Deuteronomy 32:8, it could also be interpreted in line with the position in Jubilees that angels were appointed over nations to mislead them (Jubilees 15:31; see also 12:20). Without suggesting a linear historical development, one might observe a spectrum of insidiousness in the other four sources. In Numbers 22 the indefinite noun refers to a role that is filled by an angel, but the opposition is to Balaam and certainly not to God or any positive figure. In Job 1-2 the noun with the definite article refers to an individual figure among the בני האלהים. Here a greater degree of insidiousness appears in that the figure acts against a righteous person and wields destructive power. It is still very much the case, however, that the figure is entirely subject to God for permission even before doing anything more than making accusations.

Again with the definite article, such a figure acts in Zechariah 3 against a righteous person. This time the accusation is more insidious in as much as it appears to be a groundless accusation. Even here, the accuser is just doing the job of accusing, and hardly wields any power against God. 1 Chronicles 21:1 presents the most interesting case for our purposes. Here שטן appears without the definite article as a particular cosmic figure, and quite likely should be taken as a proper noun.<sup>53</sup> The figure in this verse is quite insidious indeed, arising against Israel and inciting David to do something against the will of God that will bring death and destruction. The interesting issue from the perspective of the study of Jubilees is that 2 Samuel 24:1 relates the same story, except

---

<sup>53</sup> JPS, NRSV and RSV translate as a proper noun, whereas the New American Bible translates “A satan...”

God is the one who incites David.<sup>54</sup> Jubilees also displays the tendency to assign to a distinct figure the unbecoming deeds previously attributed directly to God. Received scripture conveys a variety of ideas about a heavenly accuser, the most insidious of which is more insidious than Mastema in Jubilees.<sup>55</sup>

#### 5.1.4.3. The early apocalypses

When we turn to the apocalypses known to have existed by the time of Jubilees we find neither the terminology nor the idea in the narrow sense of an eternal cosmic figure dedicated to opposition to God or righteous humans. Consequently, at least in the earlier period, it is a fallacy to identify the idea of satan as an apocalyptic idea. The discussion still belongs in this dissertation, however, not because the figure of satan is typically apocalyptic, but because at the level of worldview, the idea is related to what has already been considered about the nature of evil. The beasts in Daniel, the fallen watchers, and the national princes in Daniel and the Animal Apocalypse differ from the idea of Satan not only in terminology but in permanence.<sup>56</sup> No one figure rules over evil throughout all time. There is, however, a pattern of supernatural opposition. The narrative detail of a specific eternal ruler of evil is not particularly tied to the apocalypses, but the

---

<sup>54</sup> 1 Chronicles 21 interprets “the anger of the Lord” in 1 Samuel 24 as an independent figure. See Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 209 n. 19.

<sup>55</sup> In 1 Chronicles the figure arises and acts independently and succeeds in causing great destruction. Although the story indirectly leads to the temple in Jerusalem, there is no explicit mention either that God had willed the whole sequence or that the “Satan” was put to shame.

<sup>56</sup> See the next chapter on the temporal axis. Apocalypses typically view evil not so much as a persistent state or as a gradual progression, but an infestation that surges twice in world history: once before the flood and again before the final judgment. Thus, at this stage, a permanent figure of evil would not fit well.

worldview of independent cosmic evil is. It is true that Jubilees manipulates certain details in other notions of “satan,” but the main interest for this dissertation is how Jubilees uses the figure of Mastema to undermine the idea of cosmic opposition to God.

#### 5.1.4.4. Mastema in Jubilees

In Jubilees, Mastema is no enemy of God. Mastema is the heavenly sanitation worker—doing the dirty work of leading other nations from God and carrying out violent missions when commanded by God. Mastema fills certain exegetical needs and explains whatever dark power might be perceived in foreign religion, but emphatically lacks power over Israel under the law and plays no role whatsoever in the eschatological crisis where one might expect a showdown between the forces of good and evil. Mastema never claims victory or rule over Israel, only shame. Arguably, Mastema never sins and is never judged.<sup>57</sup> We will consider the functions of Mastema in two categories. First, we will consider the role of Mastema in carrying out God’s plan for the nations. Second, we will consider the use of Mastema to interpret the biblical history of Israel.

As we have already seen, God commands angels and demons to rule over *other* nations, not only because of their wickedness, but also to lead them astray because God

---

<sup>57</sup> Jubilees 10:8 may refer to a future time when Mastema is to be judged, but if so it is peculiar that the only mention of this possibility comes from the mouth of Mastema. In the context of the verse, “before me... the authority of my will,” it seems more likely that ቅድመ : ኩነት should be read in the sense of “before my authority,” rather than, “during the time prior to when I am to be punished.” Manuscript 58 supports reading “before me,” which, even if an error, is an error from the context. Manuscripts 35 (prior to correction) and 38 read, “before the judgment.”

Segal suggests reading “before my punishment” as chronological sequence; first the demons do the job of destroying and misleading, and then Mastema does the job of punishing. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 177.

intends to be God for only one nation (Jubilees 15:31). Mastema appears in three passages as administrator of the demons assigned by God to other nations. As we have already seen, Jubilees allows for some diminished role for demons to explain whatever power may be perceived in foreign religion. On the narrative level, Mastema fills the function of advocacy for the demons. Most importantly, Mastema does not act against the will of God. Mastema simply points out that the demons serve a valuable function for afflicting sinners. Mastema persuades God, but does not exercise any power against God.

Mastema's next appearance develops the identification of idolatry and demon-worship. Abram's experience as a youth illustrates the difference between being misled into idolatry and following reason to God. The idolaters are placed under Mastema's control (Jubilees 11:5), which takes the form of diminished harvest (11:11). Abram demonstrates his ability to outwit Mastema first with agricultural invention, and then by uncovering the deception of idolatry and divination. The logical conclusion to the contrast is that Abraham's religion has the power to defeat whatever power may exist behind foreign religion. Although Mastema is not mentioned by name (or office, as it were), the connection is easily made in chapter 15 when God commissions other powers to rule over other nations but to stay away from Israel. In Jubilees 19:28 the function of Mastema is to remove other nations from following God, with the intent that no children of Israel would follow the other nations in their wrong direction. Most importantly, the function of Mastema and the demons is the function given to them at the command of God. Jubilees does not deny that any of Israel have ever abandoned their protection from demons by associating with the other nations, subjecting themselves to their punishment. Two emphases, however, remain distinctive. First, the defeat of the demons is easily accomplished, for Israel, with repentance. Second, the demons do not afflict the

righteous—they may try, but they succeed only in shaming themselves. They are vehicles for just punishment, not an explanation for unjust suffering.

Mastema also has a second function that does pertain directly to Israel. Mastema becomes the agent of actions that Genesis and Exodus had attributed to God, but which Jubilees (among other ancient interpretations) viewed to be unfitting of a supremely benevolent God. In each case Jubilees continues to emphasize that Mastema operates within the limits of the command of God. Mastema never claims any victory over Israel. Mastema does the dirty work of God, but never acts against God. In the first instance, Jubilees uses Mastema to solve two theological problems stemming from Genesis 22. First, Jubilees reconciles Genesis 22:12 with the principle of divine omniscience by reading “now I know” as “now I have made known.”<sup>58</sup> Borrowing a page from Job, Jubilees uses Mastema to explain to whom Abraham’s righteousness needed to be made known. The fact that God did know how it would turn out leads to the second point. While the inexplicable and cruel demand in Genesis 22 might seem unfitting for a benevolent and loving God, Jubilees gives God a good reason for the trial. The trial becomes an opportunity to put Mastema to shame. Arguably, by the time of the revelation of the Law Mastema learns that Israel is off-limits, since Mastema does not appear in the eschatological sequence or any of the “predictions” relative to the time of Moses. (Mastema’s final status in the narrative is having been bound—perhaps Mastema remains bound permanently.) On one hand, Mastema does fill the role attributed to the accuser in Job 1-2 (which itself is one of the less insidious roles attached to the term).<sup>59</sup> On the other

---

<sup>58</sup> Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 302.

<sup>59</sup> Mastema is associated with the verb “accuse” in Jubilees 48:15. When one reads the book as a whole, one discovers a more general divergence from the idea of a heavenly accuser (satan) as a bad thing.

hand, Mastema fills the role attributed to God in Genesis 22. Jubilees is constrained by received scripture and the theological principles of God's benevolence and omniscience. Jubilees uses the figure of Mastema to the extent of deflecting any appearances of cruelty or witlessness from God, but far short of creating an opponent to God's just sovereignty.

In the same way, on several occasions in the life of Moses, Mastema takes on functions that had been attributed to God directly. The theological problems are familiar: Why does God try to kill Moses?<sup>60</sup> Why do the Egyptian magicians have any supernatural power?<sup>61</sup> Even when the slaughter of the Egyptians is justified, how is God's role in bloodshed to be understood?<sup>62</sup> Mastema is a harsh figure to the extent of taking on the harshness otherwise attributed to God, but not evil in a dualistic sense that necessitates an opposition to God.<sup>63</sup> Jubilees 48:3-4 is the borderline case which demonstrates the limit on how hard Jubilees pushes the point that cosmic agents do not successfully interfere in the direct rule of Israel by God. There Mastema does what God

---

In the view of Jubilees, justice reigns persistently. Thus, the accusing that goes on in Jubilees generally is positive accusation of the wicked (Jubilees 4:6, 23-24). When one has perfect trust in the judicial system, the office of accuser is hardly sinister.

<sup>60</sup> In Exodus, Moses might appear lax with the commandments while his Egyptian wife becomes his savior. In Jubilees neither circumcision nor Zipporah are mentioned, but Mastema does start to take on the role of advocate for the Egyptians, and the revealing angel becomes the savior.

<sup>61</sup> Jubilees does not oppose the idea that some power can be perceived in other religions, but emphasizes that is it only destructive, never constructive (Jubilees 48:10). Even at that, the higher angels can deprive such magicians of their feeble power (48:11).

<sup>62</sup> Whereas God kills the Egyptian firstborns in Exodus 11:4; 12:12-13, 27, 29, in Jubilees 49:2 God only gives the command and Mastema's forces do the dirty work. Jubilees perhaps finds Mastema suggested in Exodus 12:23, *הַמַּשְׁחִית* "the Destroyer." See further, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "The Festivals of Pesah and Massot in The Book of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

<sup>63</sup> Michael Mach discusses the fact that "demons" are not necessarily opposed to God, "... it is not self-evident that heavenly beings with negative effects on humans are necessarily opposed to God. They may just fulfill his will, and their deeds will then appear as punishing acts (e.g., ... 1QS, iv.12-13...)." Michael Mach, "Demons," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 190.

does in Exodus 4:24 (trying to kill Moses) and is thwarted by the angel of the presence. One might count this as an exception to the overall pattern of inverting the apocalyptic worldview of angelic agency, but the constraining factor is the interpretation of scripture with a particular set of theological presuppositions. The need to explain Exodus 4:24 (God tried to kill Moses) trumps the inversion of the apocalyptic worldview. Even though Mastema appears here as an enemy, Mastema is still not successful or out of control for any length of time.<sup>64</sup>

Although Jubilees *tends* to separate harsh action from God directly, the tendency slips, for example, when the same forces are described as “Mastema’s forces” in 49:2 and then “the Lord’s forces” in 49:4. At every turn Mastema either acts under direct command of God or is allowed to act for a specific purpose before being quickly restrained. It is in this context that we find the maxim used to introduce this section, “The Lord’s forces did everything that the Lord ordered them” (ወገብሩ ፡ ጎይላቲሁ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ዘመጠነ ፡ አዘዞሙ ፡ እግዚአብሔር; Jubilees 49:4). One might even find humor in the back-and-forth pattern of Mastema’s unbinding and binding in Jubilees 48:15-18. The dominion of the beasts in Daniel and the shepherds in the Animal Apocalypse, though temporary, is sustained enough to achieve substantial unjust

---

<sup>64</sup> Michael Segal perceives a theological seam between Jubilees 48 and 49, with the former portraying Mastema as an independent entity and patron of Egypt, and the latter portraying Mastema as strictly subordinate to God. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 226-227. I would not call the seam a contradiction, however. Jubilees 2 and 15 show that lower angels can be assigned to rule over nations and still be divine envoys. Both 48 and 49 convey a worldview of God in complete control, it is just that Jubilees 48 must work harder to interpret the dramatic opposition in the Exodus narrative. Even in 48, Mastema is hardly a menacing figure. It is true that Mastema is *permitted* to do things in 48:10 and Mastema’s forces are *sent* to do things in 49:2, and perhaps that difference in tone may suggest a compositional process in which Jubilees 48 is more derivative than 49 (though each is derivative in its own way). The seam is not a sloppy contradiction, but has been largely (if not perfectly) smoothed over with other changes. If Jubilees 48 differs in tone with Jubilees 49 over whether Mastema is permitted or sent to do bad things, it concurs in other verbs such as “not allowed,” “deprived,” and “put to shame.”

suffering. In contrast, God uses Mastema in short, controlled bursts to the end of destroying the Egyptians and profiting Israel (Jubilees 48:18). Mastema never succeeds in causing any suffering in Israel.<sup>65</sup> To the extent to which Mastema is comparable to an angelic prince of the Egyptians (Jubilees 48:3), the advocacy is that of a clumsy stooge. Nyuk-nyuk-nyuk.



Figure 5.1: Mastema bound

We can conclude that Jubilees does not at all convey the idea of Satan that *modern* readers seem to persistently expect.<sup>66</sup> The expectations of the original audience may well have been different, however. To the extent to which Jubilees creates reader expectations about a “satan” figure, it does so by using the plural indefinite noun “satans” and a similar (but different) term, “Mastema.” The genre “apocalypse,” at the time of

---

<sup>65</sup> Conspicuously, Mastema is never associated with any actual harm done by the Egyptians, such as the idea to throw infant boys into the river. Daniel and the Animal Apocalypse, on the other hand, are trying to explain forces that are succeeding quite well in harming the righteous (Daniel 7:21, 25; 8:10-12; 11:36; Animal Apocalypse 89:65ff.).

<sup>66</sup> Russell, *Method & Message*, 257. It is less surprising that treatments that focus on the Christian idea of Satan, spending no more than a chapter on the pre-Christian background of the idea, flatten Mastema into later developments. For example, three works of this nature make the same mistake in asserting that Mastema, not God, orders Abraham to sacrifice Isaac. Russell, *The Devil*, 204. Pagels, *The Origin of Satan*, 54. Wray and Mobley, *The Birth of Satan*, 103. The same specific error is made in Russell, *The Devil*, 51. None of these sources cite another for this misinformation.



Jubilees, has nothing to do with creating an expectation of a particular eternal cosmic accuser of the righteous or enemy of God. To the extent to which there may have been a reader expectation that a figure named “Mastema” would be insidious, Jubilees might be said to invert that expectation. More likely, Jubilees draws from scriptural and other traditions about a heavenly accuser, and develops that figure within its own worldview, keeping toward the less insidious end of the spectrum. Mastema is a case of distinctive thought, not polemic.

The satan motif is not a worldview. Even though the particular idea of a single eternal accuser or harsh prince is not typical of the apocalypses, the idea of cosmic agents of unjust oppression is part of the apocalyptic worldview. Jubilees develops the idea of Mastema as a foil for God’s hostility toward other nations and specific cases of biblical interpretation. Most importantly, Jubilees does so within a worldview that holds God’s sovereignty and benevolence toward Israel to be absolute, unmediated, and uninterrupted.

The main difference, besides use of the term, between the idea of Satan as an eternal ruler of all enmity against God, and the beasts and corrupt angels that do appear in contemporary apocalypses, is that the enemies of God in the apocalypses are temporally limited. Their rise is associated with the climax of history, a final showdown between good and evil. In the next section we will see how Mastema, demons, and satans, such as they do function in Jubilees, are the temporal inverse of the eschatological enemies of God in the apocalypses. Mastema never appears in any of the “predictive” passages, referring to the future relative to Moses. When Jubilees turns to the eschatological conflict and restoration in chapter 23, no angels or demons play any role whatsoever on either side. Rather than becoming more prominent toward the end, in Jubilees, such forces lose significance.

#### 5.1.5. Angels and demons in the eschatological crisis and restoration

This sub-section brings us to the most central and the clearest case of difference between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. For the sake of organization we are considering the spatial axis and the temporal axis in separate chapters, but the heart of the apocalyptic worldview is the nexus of the two axes. In this sub-section we consider the agents of the spatial axis at the eschatological moment on the temporal axis. The differences between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses are sometimes subtle, as in the accounts of the origin of evil. When we look for the roles of supernatural agents in the eschatological climax, the difference is unmistakable. Especially in the historical apocalypses, but also in the cosmic tours, supernatural agents, good and bad, are most active in the climax of evil, the final conflict, the judgment and the restoration. In Jubilees the situation is reversed. Angels and demons serve certain functions in the normal progress of history, but in all the versions of eschatological crises in Jubilees the only agents are humans and God directly. This is especially clear in Jubilees 23 which emphasizes the roles of humans and God and then only mentions satans and evil ones as being absent. As we will see more in the next chapter, the idea of future eschatology takes some twists in Jubilees, so we will also consider the absence of angelic agents in *all* the judgment scenarios in Jubilees. First we will consider the role of supernatural agents (besides God) in eschatological scenarios in contemporary apocalypses.

#### 5.1.5.1. The early apocalypses

The ideas of reversal in history and supernatural agency are hardly exclusive to the apocalyptic genre or worldview. Even the idea that forces other than God and humans might be responsible for dark moments in history should be read as a broader tendency. It is distinctive that the apocalypses typically emphasize the agency of cosmic forces of evil in eschatological climaxes. What is most distinctive, in my opinion, is the need to assign to cosmic figures other than God directly the battle for righteousness, the judgment and the restoration.<sup>67</sup> It would take us too far afield to venture an explanation of *why* this is the case, but a few examples will demonstrate empirically that it is the case.

As we have already seen, the beasts in Daniel 7 convey a worldview of supernatural forces of evil rising and climaxing in an eschatological conflict. This view is typical of the apocalypses, but has precedent in “cosmic” struggles between *God* and Rahab or Yamm, for example.<sup>68</sup> The greater innovation comes in the agency of God in Daniel 7. God retains *ultimate* sovereignty, but appoints another cosmic figure, the human-like figure of Daniel 7:13, to exercise dominion. Other texts may mention hosts who fight with or for God (e.g. 2 Kings 6:16-17), but only in apocalypses do angelic figures gain such importance.<sup>69</sup> In other parts of the same chapter God assigns dominion to “the Holy Ones of the Most High.” Although angelic beings are homologous with their

---

<sup>67</sup> I count messianism in the sense of the assignment of cosmic functions to a *human* individual as a later phenomenon.

<sup>68</sup> See, for example, Job 26:7, 12-13; Isaiah 51:9-10.

<sup>69</sup> Even Third Isaiah, often discussed as a forerunner of the apocalyptic worldview, emphasizes God’s direct and solitary action (Isaiah 63:5; 66:16). The LXX reading of 63:9 also fits this pattern. The MT *qere* would be an exception, but in the context of past salvation, not future eschatology.

earthly counterparts, the primary and distinctively apocalyptic emphasis here is on the angelic agents (Daniel 7:18, 22, 27).<sup>70</sup> In a number of other apocalypses it is conspicuous that God does not destroy, judge or restore directly, but appoints angels to do these things. God does not even appear in Daniel 12. In the Book of the Watchers God issues commands but angels carry out all the actions, good and bad. The Animal Apocalypse makes more room for human agency, but still views the human struggle as a façade for the cosmic struggle (Animal Apocalypse 90:13-14). In the judgment and restoration of 90:20-27 the verbs are plural, indicating the seven archangels as subjects. The same emphasis on angelic agents on both sides of the eschatological struggle is true in the Epistle of Enoch 100:4 and other passages.<sup>71</sup>

In many cases passive verbs prevent us from asserting that the active agent is a cosmic being other than God, but in light of the preceding pattern one might imagine as much. The tendency to avoid mention of direct action by God is at least noteworthy. Thus for example, “without human hand” (Daniel 8:25; likewise 9:27) contrasts in tone and probably meaning from assertions about the exercise of God’s right hand (e.g. Exodus 15:6). The Apocalypse of Weeks in particular uses passive verbs that do not explicitly support but certainly fit with this pattern.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 104-105.

<sup>71</sup> The Testament of Moses is not discussed in depth because it is not an apocalypse and it is difficult to be sure what parts are contemporary with Jubilees. A broader discussion would include the work, however, because it does deal with much of the apocalyptic worldview, and often aligns more with Jubilees than the typical apocalypses. On this issue in particular we find a mixture of both emphases. God both consecrates an angel to take vengeance and then rises from the throne to punish the gentiles (Testament of Moses 10:2-3).

<sup>72</sup> Even in passages that do emphasize angelic agency, passive verbs sometimes suggest a more complex view of agency. Thus for example, the human like figure in Daniel 7 receives dominion only after someone or something else destroys the beast, and again in Daniel 11:45 the avatar of evil is destroyed (by whom?) before Michael arises and the woes truly begin.

We will consider the details of human participation in eschatological violence in the last section of this chapter. In the meantime we can at least say that the apocalypses do not typically emphasize the impact of human agency on the progress of history.<sup>73</sup> Thus, in conclusion, the apocalyptic worldview emphasizes the agency of good and bad forces other than God and humans. This is true in general, and especially in the eschatological conflict, judgment and restoration.

#### 5.1.5.2. Jubilees

We have already seen some significant differences between the worldview in Jubilees and the apocalyptic worldview. When we turn to the eschatological scenarios in Jubilees the difference is more pronounced. All other things being equal, Jubilees avoids angelic agency in any function of judgment and salvation. This is not to say, however, that Jubilees always avoids any semblance of angelic function other than teaching. In particular, as we have seen, Jubilees accounts for some of the drama and unbecoming deeds of the Exodus story with recourse to angelic agency.<sup>74</sup> The lesser issue is that Jubilees is constrained by the base text. The greater issue is that Jubilees does not present the Exodus as an eschatological judgment of the Egyptians. Jubilees also follows the

---

<sup>73</sup> Thus, for example, the martyrs of Daniel 11:32-35 do not impede the march of evil in verses 36-45. Although a number of explanations have been given for the prayer in Daniel 9, all can agree that the emphasis on human sin and repentance is out of place in the work. One certainly gets the impression that Daniel's prayer was not worth a hearing and certainly did not impact the revelation (9:23). See section 4.1.2.2.

<sup>74</sup> Even here, it would be a mistake to miss the emphasis on the agency of God and Moses. In 48:13 the revealing angel does take some credit, and Mastema has a role, but God and Moses continue to govern most action. Often enough this is just a matter of following scripture, but Jubilees 48:5 has God perform the type of action that one typically expects angels to do in apocalypses, "The Lord took revenge on all their gods and burned them up."

Book of the Watchers in specifying that angels bound the fallen watchers. There are limits to the lengths to which Jubilees goes to downplay angelic agency in judgment when constrained by other factors, such as the interest in asserting that sin never goes unpunished. We should not imagine that the author of Jubilees had the issue of angelic agency front and center. It is the case, however, that Jubilees conveys a worldview that differs from the apocalyptic worldview on agents other than God and humans, especially in an eschatological context.

**Jubilees 23.** The primary eschatological scenario in Jubilees is chapter 23. The emphasis on human culpability for the “final woes” is itself distinctive. More distinctive still is the fact that the woes, particularly foreign invasion, are sent directly by God—there are no beasts arising or angelic princes conspiring or becoming blind. God acts directly for the clear purpose of punishing human sin.

ወይከውን ፡ መቅሠፍት ፡ ዐቢይ ፡ ዲበ ፡ ግብረ ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ትውልድ ፡ እምነበ ፡  
እግዚአብሔር...

[JCVK] There will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation... (Jubilees 23:22)

Those who study the law (23:26) are not merely guaranteeing their own resurrection (Daniel 11), or allying themselves with a cosmic super-power (Animal Apocalypse 90:12-16), but actually initiate the restoration themselves. God takes over for all functions other than Torah study, and never commissions any other being to carry out any aspect of the restoration. No angels or humans are given swords to carry out vengeance or any other particular action. God does the healing and expelling of enemies, while the righteous need only witness God’s direct and singular action,

አሜሃ ፡ ይፌውስ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ አግብርቲሁ ፡ ወይትነሥኡ ፡ ወይፊእዩ ፡  
ሰላመ ፡ ዐቢየ ፡ ወይሰድድ ፡ ጸላእቶ ፡ ወይፊእዩ ፡ ሳድቃን ፡ ወያእኩቱ ፡

ወይትፌሥሐ : እስከ : ለዓለመ : ዓለም : በፍሥሐ :: ወይሬእዩ : በፀሮሙ :  
ኩሎ : ኩነኔሆሙ : ወኩሎ : መርገሞሙ

[JCVK] Then the Lord will heal his servants. They will rise and see great peace. He will expel his enemies. The righteous will see (this), offer praise, and be very happy forever and ever. They will see all their punishments and curses on their enemies. (Jubilees 23:30)

As if to guarantee that the reader noticed the conspicuous silence, the sequence makes clear that ወአልቦ : መነሂ : ሰይጣን : ወአልቦ : መነሂ : እኩዮ “there will be no satan or evil one” (Jubilees 23:29).

Some scholars have read this phrase as proof of the importance of Satan in the worldview of Jubilees,<sup>75</sup> but here and in three other comments like it, the word “no” must be taken into account. Except for one instance where emendation is well supported, (Jubilees 10:11), satans are mentioned only when they are absent. Their presence otherwise may follow logically, but noting the lack of satans does not emphasize that satans are otherwise prominent. We have already considered the extremely qualified role of demons in Jubilees, and the likelihood that “satans” is a more general category than demons that includes human trouble makers. Furthermore, the absence of satans does not exclusively refer to eschatological utopia, but in two other instances refers to the time of peace and prosperity in Egypt under Joseph (40:9; 46:2). The next chapter will return to the fact that the eschatological restoration is a restoration of natural good things that are perceived to have already existed in the past. Jubilees 23 both *says* that agents other than God and humans are absent, and follows through on this assertion in the account of events.

---

<sup>75</sup> See, for example, Wray and Mobley, *The Birth of Satan*, 104.

**The rest of the book.** Jubilees 23 is the most detailed eschatological account in Jubilees, but the same point holds for similar mentions throughout the book. At the end of the book, Jubilees 50:5 makes a brief reference to a future time of purity and security in similar terms,

ወኢዮቤሌዎታት፡ የጎልፉ፡ እስከ፡ አመ፡ ይነጽሕ፡ እስራኤል፡ እምኩሉ፡  
 አበሳ፡ ዝሙት፡ ወርኩስ፡ ወግማኔ፡ ወጎጢአት፡ ወጌጋይ፡ ወየጎድር፡  
 ውስተ፡ ኩሉ፡ ምድር፡ እንዘ፡ ይትአመን፡ ወአልቦ፡ እንከ፡ ሎቱ፡  
 መነሂ፡ ሰይጣን፡ ወአልቦ፡ መነሂ፡ እኩዮ፡ ወትነጽሕ፡ ምድር፡  
 እምውእቱ፡ ጊዜ፡ እስከ፡ ኩሉ፡ መዋዕል ።

[JCVK] The jubilees will pass by until Israel is pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin, and error. Then they will live confidently in the entire land. They will no longer have any satan or any evil person. The land will be pure from that time until eternity. (Jubilees 50:5)

The context makes clear that it is the responsibility of Israel to observe purity laws, and God in turn will establish prosperity and security. No non-human force prevents Israel from being pure, and no being other than God establishes prosperity and security. Another passage establishes a high view of the agency of Israel in the cosmos, although an eschatological chronology is not explicit. Abraham says of the descendents of Jacob,

ወእሙንቱ፡ ይኩኑ፡ ለሃርሮ፡ ሰማይ፡ ወለአጽንዖ፡ ምድር፡ ወለሐድሶ፡  
 ኩሉ፡ ብርሃናት፡ ዘዲበ፡ ምጽናዓት ።

[JCVK] May they serve (the purpose of) laying heaven's foundations, making the earth firm, and renewing all the luminaries which are above the firmament. (Jubilees 19:25)

Even if it is not necessarily eschatological here, it draws on images that are typically eschatological in the apocalypses. Most importantly, the roles are reversed. Here, Israel contributes to restoring the heavens and the earth. In the apocalypses, angelic agency dominates human affairs.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> It may be, in my view, the intercessory role of Enoch supports this more than it qualifies it, not only because Enoch is elevated to angelic status, but because BW emphasizes that the roles *should* be reversed



Jubilees 1 also resembles the historical apocalypses in giving an after-the-fact account of the history of Israel after the time of Moses. This chapter continues the pattern of never mentioning demonic agency against Israel in the covenantal period, except with a negation. The “curses” of Israel are not demonic but covenantal. God and God alone afflicts Israel, and only in proportion to their sin for the purpose of prompting repentance (Jubilees 1:10). Jubilees 1:11 mentions the demons as objects to whom the sinners of Israel will sacrifice their children. Even here, where the logic applied to other nations would imply that the demons afflict them in turn, Jubilees denies that any besides God will afflict Israel (see again Jubilees 15:31). Likewise, the prayer of Moses mentions the “spirit of Belial” (perhaps better translated, as JPS does Deuteronomy 15:9, “base thought”),<sup>77</sup> but again with the negative modifier, “may it *not* rule over them.” Arguably, this might not refer to an eschatological sequence *per se*, and thus may not fit well in this sub-section. It only strengthens the case if even in quasi-eschatological scenarios (besides Jubilees 23 and 50) angelic and demonic forces have no influence over Israel. Of course the narrative focus of the book predates the covenantal period, but it remains striking that Jubilees says much about angels and demons, but nothing but denial when it comes to Israel under the covenant and in the future restoration.

In the next chapter I will suggest that Jubilees does not follow the Book of the Watchers in the view that the judgment of all will occur at once (BW 16:1). In anticipation of this, it is worth adding to this sub-section that the various national days of judgment throughout Jubilees (that is, judgment of other nations) do not involve angelic

---

(BW 15:2). Enoch’s (failed) intercessory mission and his testimony do not negate the overwhelming emphasis on good and bad angels in the origin and judgment of evil.

<sup>77</sup> See page 289 above.

agents of judgment. For example the judgment of Lot's descendents in 16:9 takes a singular verb with God as a subject. Similarly, with more of an exegetical background, Jubilees removes angelic judgment where it existed in Genesis in the Babel story. Genesis 11:17 might suggest to some (without recourse to the "royal we") that God acted with angelic allies against Babel, **הָבָה נִרְדָּה וְנִבְלָה שָׁם שְׂפָתָם**. Jubilees 10:23, however, allows no angelic agency. One would hardly say that Jubilees eliminates angels in general. On the contrary, Jubilees develops the issue of their role in God's cosmos. What Jubilees says about them, however, is striking. They teach, reveal, and do other things on direct orders (Jubilees 49:4), but they do not do what they typically do in apocalypses, particularly afflict, fight, judge, and restore in an eschatological context.

We do not know, nor do we need to know, the extent to which the ancient author was conscious of this. Perhaps in some cases we can more easily imagine the author maintaining a negative evaluation of the ideas typically conveyed by apocalypses and deliberately setting out to debunk the apocalypses in their own terms. In other cases, however, we might be observing a subconscious pattern: when the author of Jubilees thinks of cosmic justice, the author thinks of God taking charge of justice directly and singularly. For example, the example from Babel need not have come from a conscious effort to solve a problem in Genesis 11:17, but simply a certain way of looking at things and retelling them. Comparison with other sources does not necessarily prove that the author of Jubilees wrote polemically to refute a text or a worldview, but it does prove that the worldview of Jubilees is distinctive within the framework of contemporary Jewish thought, and unique among the apocalypses.

## 5.2. Humans

### 5.2.1. Groups

The previous section studied several ways in which Jubilees uses angels and demons but places them in a worldview that differs from that of the typical apocalypses. These kinds of agents are the core of the spatial axis which partly defines the genre “apocalypse.”<sup>78</sup> The spatial axis can also address the order of humanity from a transcendent perspective. The classification of humanity, particularly for purposes of eschatological salvation, is a frequent, though not definitive, element of the apocalypses. Not all apocalypses deal with issues of election or convey a worldview that can be called sectarian, proto-sectarian, or, in the other direction, universalistic. The illocution of the genre may not necessarily convey a worldview of human classification to the same extent as the angelic and related agents of the spatial axis. There may be an empirical basis at the time of Jubilees, however, for associating the apocalyptic worldview with exclusivist or universalistic tendencies. Contemporary apocalypses often define an elect group within Israel for special (or sole) status in the restoration, while abandoning or condemning other parts of Israel. The category “descendent of Jacob,” can be abandoned in the other direction if outsiders are included as equals or above parts of Israel. On this issue as well, Jubilees expresses a very different worldview. Other than the traditional distinction of Levites and the high priest, the category “Israel” is of absolute significance

---

<sup>78</sup> Jubilees does not dwell on their domains. An exhaustive study might consider the angelic liturgy, the heavenly geography, the ranks of angels (and how they mirror the ranks of humans), the non-corruption of heaven in the version of the sinful watchers, the holy places, and the (lack of) non-earthly places of judgment and reward.

for Jubilees. No gentiles are welcome, and no groups within Israel are singled out for special punishment or reward.

Again a few simplifications and overstatements must be avoided. The issue of universalism is more difficult than the election of a remnant within Israel in as much as it is not always clear whether the other nations are “converting” and joining Israel, or if the category “Israel” is being abandoned. Consequently, we will focus our efforts on the idea of an elect group within Israel that is saved while the rest of Israel is condemned. We must also avoid the exaggeration that Jubilees is particularly conciliatory. The unity of Israel does *not* take the form of tolerance of different attitudes towards calendar, exogamy, and other legal issues. Although the Animal Apocalypse is usually one of the clearest points of contrast with Jubilees, they overlap here in imagining Israel unified behind the one true way (their own). Even here, however, contrast can be seen in whether the anticipated unification of Israel is viewed as the vindictive destruction of enemies within Israel, or as a snowballing movement of peaceful enlightenment and prosperity. Finally, I do not identify the literary treatment of exclusivity of election with the issue of sectarianism (nor do I deny the possibility of certain relationships). I am dealing with literary features and worldview, not social realities. We do not know how large or isolated the group of the author of Jubilees may have been. We cannot be sure how reasonable it may have been at the time to hope that a certain calendar would be restored or established. We know that Israel was never, in fact, united behind the study of the law as taught by Jubilees. The point is that Jubilees imagined that it would be.

#### 5.2.1.1. Third Isaiah

A number of passages from received scripture could be brought as background to the second century ideas about election and group definition. Perhaps the most demonstrably relevant passages come from Third Isaiah. It seems likely that the influence of Isaiah, including these chapters, was widespread. The interpretation, not the status, of Isaiah was disputed. In Third Isaiah we find the category “Israel” challenged in both directions: election of an internal remnant, and inclusion of non-Israel. Without getting into the social groups at the time(s) of composition, on a literary level alone the text lends itself to the idea that not all of Israel has a share in the future hope. For example, Isaiah 65:9 can suggest salvation of an elect group within Israel by reading a partitive use of מִן.

וְהוֹצֵאתִי מִיַּעֲקֹב זֶרַע וּמִיִּהוּדָה יוֹרֵשׁ הָרִי וִירְשׁוּהָ בְּחִירֵי וְעַבְדֵי יִשְׁכְּנוּ-שָׁמָּה:  
(Isaiah 65:9)

The idea that God’s sovereignty and worship will extend beyond Israel to all humanity is not particularly rare, as for example in Isaiah 66:16. The more controversial assertion appears in Isaiah 66:21.

וְגַם-מֵהֶם אֶקַּח לְכֹהֲנִים לְלוֹאִים (Isaiah 65:21)

Thus we can see that the dissolution of the category “Israel,” both in designating a sub-group and elevating outsiders, is not the exclusive domain of the apocalypses.

Nevertheless, I am hardly the first to notice that a number of apocalypses convey a worldview that designates an elect group within Israel (other than the traditional categories of priests and levites), and includes some outside Israel. The debate centers on the social mechanism of continuity, not the existence of similar patterns.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> The classic work on the sociological relationship between Third Isaiah and later Apocalypticism is Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*.

#### 5.2.1.2. The Enochic apocalypses

Before proceeding with the earliest known apocalypses, the Book of the Watchers and the Astronomical Book, it will be helpful to clarify what is implied by dealing with these works as “contemporary” to Jubilees. I am neither defending nor contesting any of the theories of the social setting of the original composition of these works; I am dealing with them as literature, as read at the time of Jubilees. Thus it does not matter what these works *originally* meant with the use of terms such as “chosen,” “righteous,” “elect,” and “plant.” It is clear enough from dependent texts, both before and shortly after Jubilees, that they were interpreted within a worldview of a new elect group within Judaism, which often potentially includes non-Jews. One finds in the introduction to the Book of the Watchers a polarity (not to suggest dualism, *per se*) between “wicked,” “sinners” and the “elect,” “chosen,” “righteous.” At the same time, there is a complete lack of any clear reference to Israel as a nation. The observation cannot be dismissed as an antediluvian setting, since so much of the orientation of the introduction applies to later days. While this cannot be called indisputable evidence, it does fit a pattern. One finds more distinctive language in the Book of the Watchers 10:16 with the “plant of righteousness and truth.”

Any discussion of the Astronomical Book must be qualified by the fact that we are not sure how much of the wording of the Ethiopic version reflects the most ancient version, or what versions should be classified as examples of the genre “apocalypse.”<sup>80</sup> It is not the case that the main body of the Astronomical Book focuses on human groups.

---

<sup>80</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 60-61, especially note 49.

Nevertheless, we do find language within the same pattern, “the good will inform the good about righteousness, the righteous will rejoice with the righteous, and they will greet each other” (Astronomical Book 81:8). The specificity comes not in the terminology but the associated actions. “The righteous” are defined as those who study certain texts and use a certain calendar (AB 82:4). Similarly, a concrete criterion can be understood in “Those who understand will not sleep and will listen with their ear to learn this wisdom. It will be more pleasing to them than fine food to those who eat” (AB 82:3). Thus “righteous” and similar terms are no longer simply adjectives but designations for a definable group. We have to be careful about arguing from silence with respect to any acknowledgment of Israel as a meaningful group, yet one does get the sense that wisdom is not limited to one of the nations descended from Enoch (AB 82:2). Indeed, it seems likely that the choice of Enoch as the voice of “pseudepigraphy” reflects a worldview of a “natural law” that applies to all humanity. The wise and righteous are neither all of Israel nor only Israel.

The Apocalypse of Weeks uses a fundamental literary pattern of periods of history culminating in election of an individual or group for salvation.<sup>81</sup> The text emphasizes a worldview of election which may have once included Israel but goes on to elect only a group within Israel. The idea of the pattern is not radical. The Pentateuch certainly fits concentric circles of election in Noah (over everyone), Abraham (over everyone), Isaac (over Ishmael), Jacob (over Esau), Levi, Aaron, and Phinehas. Three points are, however, distinctive. First, the history varies in a tendentious way at the end. The election of Enoch (week 1), Noah (week 2), and Abraham (week 3) are the least

---

<sup>81</sup> See especially *Ibid.*, 65.

disputed.<sup>82</sup> The election of the covenant, tabernacle and temple (weeks 4 and 5) are not particularly tendentious, except in the avoidance of figures such as Aaron, Phinehas, and Zadok. In the sixth week, the relevant point is not so much the heavenly ascent of Elijah but the un-choosing of Israel. The chosen plant is cut down, as it were, to a chosen root. Nothing good is said of the post-exilic period either, except that at its end a new group would be chosen. We need not consider every plausible speculation about this group and how it correlates with external evidence. The internal evidence is perfectly clear that this apocalypse thoroughly emphasizes a worldview that hopes for salvation of only a group, not all of Israel. A second distinctive point should be observed in the violent vindictiveness of this group against the rest of Israel (Apocalypse of Weeks 91:11-13; end of Week 7, Week 8). Third, after the wicked of Israel descend to punishment, the other nations ascend to equality in an (apparently new) covenant of righteousness (AW 91:14; Week 9).

The rest of the Epistle of Enoch fits the same pattern, perhaps less emphatically so than the Apocalypse of Weeks. “Righteous” is more than an adjective; “the righteous” are defined by possession of certain books (Epistle of Enoch 104:13). Scholars have emphasized different aspects of “testifying against the sons of the earth” (Epistle of Enoch 105:1). This may indeed mean that the group is not cloistered or detached to such an extent that they have no contact with others.<sup>83</sup> I would emphasize that the role of testifying *against* is hardly a mark of solidarity. The Epistle of Enoch certainly fits the

---

<sup>82</sup> Positive inclusion of Enoch in salvation history may have become disputed in some much later texts, but it is not the case that the figure of Enoch defined a sect of Judaism in the second century BCE, or that Jews could not agree to say something nice about Enoch as part of the history of righteous figures (e.g., Genesis, Sirach, Jubilees).

<sup>83</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 71.



pattern presently under discussion, although there are still legitimate reservations on whether it should be counted as a contemporary apocalypse.

With a tinge of military propaganda, the *Animal Apocalypse* attempts to portray the nation united in suffering under the oppression of foreign rulers and a few bad sheep, as it were. The promised resolution also emphasizes unity and equality. We have the means to read through the propaganda and know that quite a bit of Israel fell outside the view of who has a place in the restoration. The unity envisaged comes only with the deaths of all opposed to the rule of Judah Maccabee. Historically, it is easy to identify the *Animal Apocalypse* as an exclusive partisan perspective. Literarily, the images of unity must be balanced with the images of vindication and vengeance.

The *Animal Apocalypse* portrays not so much a single group as an alliance, and not so much orthodoxy as loyalty to the right side of a (civil) war. Although the *Animal Apocalypse* may emphasize foreign oppression more than civil war, even without recourse to other sources we can find evidence of a divided view of Israel. On the good side one finds an alliance of a pietistic movement that had previously taken to violence without success, together with the military forces of Judah Maccabee. The former are allegorized by young lambs that open their eyes, the latter by rams (*Animal Apocalypse* 90:6-10). On the bad side one needs to read past the other nations to find the references to the enemies within Israel. First, a group of Jews is portrayed as blind and deaf, apparently in as much as they reject the reforms of the pietistic movement (90:7). After the revolt begins, some or much of Israel is blamed for not supporting it. The tone is not bitterness, as if enemy collaborators, but exhortation to aid those who are being persecuted unjustly (for starting a revolt). Unfortunately for the casual reader, Tiller and Nickelsburg present

in their main texts an emendation that is not required or supported by any manuscript.<sup>84</sup>

They emend “wild sheep” to “wild beasts,” removing a clear reference to a group of Jews who are viewed as the enemy and allied with the foreign oppressor. We may not know how the numbers were divided between those of Israel who supported Judah Maccabee, those who sought neutrality, and those who sought to put down his revolt. It is at least clear, however, that the Animal Apocalypse identifies a group of Jews as the enemy.

The case becomes unmistakable in the restoration. The judgment culminates in the fiery torment of the “blinded sheep,” the Jews who refused to join the pietists and the Maccabean side of the civil war. The enmity is magnified by placing these opponents in the same judgment as the cosmic forces of evil from the beginning of time and the history of oppression in Israel. Although the Animal Apocalypse attempts to portray the enemy as foreign oppressors and a handful of traitors, the eschatological judgment shows the true interest. There may be foreign armies to defeat, but the burning of bones in the fiery abyss is reserved for enemies within Israel, along with the cosmic forces of evil.

After the military victory is decided, as the envisaged restoration unfolds, the other nations actually fare quite well. Again, we should not conflate the variations on universalism. The foreign nations are “included” in the restoration not as equals but as a second class below “the sheep that remained” (Animal Apocalypse 90:30). The vindication of Israel is an important step in the restoration. As the restoration continues, however, the Animal Apocalypse undoes the election Israel and the division of the nations.

---

<sup>84</sup> Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 358 n. 8, 363-364. VanderKam and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 133 note g. Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 389 note 16b.

ወርኢኩ : እስከ : ተወለዐ : ኩሉ : አዝማዲሆሙ : ወኩን : ኩሉሙ :  
 አልህምተ : ጸዓዳ

[PAT] And I saw until all their species were transformed, and they all became white cattle. (Animal Apocalypse 90:38)

This may not be universalistic inclusiveness in the sense of tolerance of diversity, but it is the case that the Animal Apocalypse, in the more abstract moments, holds an ideal vision that does not separate Israel from the rest of humanity. To be sure, liberation from foreign oppression is the short-term rallying cry, but the true enemies of the Animal Apocalypse, as seen by long-term hopes, are those of Israel who do not support the pietistic movement and the Maccabean fighters. Thus we find that the “big tent” images of a unified Israel and humanity (Animal Apocalypse 90:36) operate within a worldview that is deeply vindictive and thoroughly at odds with the principles and practice of Jewish unity.

#### 5.2.1.3. The Danielic apocalypses

Multiple categories or groups within Israel appear in the final apocalypse of Daniel. The first and “lowest” category is actually the least relevant to the pattern under consideration. It was not disputed that some Jews could be described as עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ (Daniel 11:30; see also 11:32, מְרַשְׁעֵי בְרִית). Daniel does not claim that most Jews fit this category, or dwell on a particular vindictiveness toward them (12:2 notwithstanding). At the other end, the category of הַמְּשֻׁבָּלִים suggests a group.<sup>85</sup> They seem to be a sub-category of יְדֻעֵי אֱלֹהֵיוּ, those specifically in the role of teaching (Daniel 11:32-33). Membership among the מְשֻׁבָּלִים, together with martyrdom, establishes a special future

---

<sup>85</sup> Daniel 1:4 should be read in the same vein. Daniel and his comrades may not be the historical founders of the group that produced the final apocalypse of Daniel, but they are implicitly identified as analogous forerunners, מְשֻׁבָּלִים בְּכָל־חֻמָּה.

status in the restoration, or rather, transformation (Daniel 12:1-3). The condemnation of the wicked of Israel and the elevation of the most righteous is only the periphery of the issue, however.

The heart of the issue is the attitude toward the majority of Israel, referred to in Daniel as רבים or עם. On one hand, Daniel does not treat the nation with contempt—they are teachable and worthy of teaching (Daniel 11:33; 12:3). On the other hand, there is no expectation that the teaching will be received by all or efficacious in historical time (Daniel 11:33-35). The bottom line is the eschatological hope, articulated in Daniel 12:1,

(Daniel 12:1) בַּעַת הַהִיא יִמְלִיט עַמּוֹד כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר

All of Israel will be tested and given the opportunity to learn wisdom, but only some of them are expected to endure or be restored after death. To be sure, Daniel is not narrowly dualistic, notwithstanding a contrast of wicked and wise in 12:10. There are several degrees of eschatological hopes for parts of Israel, including the extremes of everlasting disgrace and shining like the splendor of the firmament. Intermediate degrees seem to include death without resurrection, endurance without death, and everlasting life (12:2-3). The main point is that Daniel singles out a group within Israel for special eschatological reward, and abandons hope that all Israel will be united in the restoration.

It would take an elaborate discussion to account for the view of foreign nations in Daniel 10-12 and in the framework of the redacted work. One can at least say that the category עַם retains significance, and seems to refer to all and only Israel, rightly guided or misguided (Daniel 11:14; 11:32-33; see also 12:4). Interestingly, Daniel 12 makes no mention of other nations. Removal may be implicit, but Daniel 12 does not emphasize punishment, conversion, or submission.

In conclusion, Daniel describes multiple categories within Israel, apparently based on orthodoxy, rather than tribal or familial descent (such as Levite, Zadokite, etc.).<sup>86</sup> Daniel 10-12 is not radically vindictive or dualistic, but does imagine a restoration in which group or class membership determines eschatological status, with the extremes of everlasting reward, everlasting punishment, and some middle ground. Daniel is not as extreme as the Apocalypse of Weeks, but certainly within a cluster of views that assigns eschatological status to groups within Israel.

#### 5.2.1.4. Jubilees

When we turn to Jubilees we find the category “Israel” is of absolute and eternal significance, from creation to restoration. The vision of unity does not take the form of tolerance of diversity, but it is striking relative to its day and relative to the other apocalypses. Jubilees insists on the unity and exclusivity of Israel. No foreigners are included. The traditional distinction of the descendents of Levi is maintained, but no new groups are designated for eschatological reward or punishment.<sup>87</sup>

When Michel Testuz combed Jubilees for an indicator of the group that produced the book he found the phrase “all the elect ones of Israel” (ለኩሉሙ : ገሩያነ : እስራኤል) in Jubilees 1:29, which he took as an early term for the group that become known as the

---

<sup>86</sup> Interestingly, different Daniel traditions identify his tribal affiliation differently. Daniel 1:6 claims descent from Judah, while the Old Greek opening of Bel and the Serpent identifies him as a priest.

<sup>87</sup> This basic observation was already made by Nickelsburg, “Strikingly different from 1 Enoch, the author [of Jubilees] emphasizes Israel’s status as the covenantal people and proscribes interaction with the gentiles and certainly the preaching of an eschatological *kerygma* that might lead to the salvation of the gentiles.” Nickelsburg, “The Nature and Function of Revelation,” 106.

Essenes.<sup>88</sup> By itself, or only in the context of an apocalypse, this ambiguous phrase suggests an elite group within Israel. Indeed, this kind of language is somewhat typical for the apocalypses, and typically conveys a more or less elitist worldview. But when we look at what the Book of Jubilees says about election and the unity of Israel, we find overwhelming data that Jubilees emphatically views *all* of Israel as elect. This may partly be explained by the primary narrative setting in the period from creation to the arrival at Sinai, and it will be important to pay close attention to chapter 23. After surveying the overwhelming emphasis of the book as a whole, the isolated instance of the phrase “all the elect of Israel” in Jubilees 1:29 appears in a new light. To the extent to which Jubilees 1:29 evokes the idea that only a portion of Israel is ultimately elected for salvation, it is ironic.<sup>89</sup>

Apart from some irrelevant uses of the term (e.g., “select warriors,” Jubilees 37:6-14), the election of Levi (Jubilees 30:18), and 1:29, Jubilees uses the language of election only for all of Israel.<sup>90</sup> We shall return to the election of Levi. First we will survey the language of election, then related phrases such as “righteous plant,” and finally the frequent use of the word “all” in phrases like “all of Jacob’s descendants.” Besides the ambiguous case in 1:29, five chapters discuss or at least refer to the election of Israel as a people (2:20; 15:30; 19:18; 22:9-10; 33:11). Even Abram is not described as chosen, and

---

<sup>88</sup> Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 33.

<sup>89</sup> One should also consider the possibility that the text is corrupt, but no manuscripts attest a non-construct form that would support a reading such as, “all of the chosen [people], Israel.”

<sup>90</sup> Although neither a concordance or electronic copy of Ethiopic Jubilees is available to me, I am confident in this assertion on the basis of searching an electronic copy of VanderKam’s translation for forms including (s)elect, choice, choose, or chose(n). I count as irrelevant the selection of choice warriors for battle in 37:6-14, the choice offering in 16:23, the watchers marrying whomever they choose in 5:1 and 7:21, Abram choosing God in 12:19, and the place God has chosen for the temple in 32:10.

Ishmael and Esau are emphatically not chosen, since descent from Abraham does not constitute election,

እስመ : ይስማዔልሃ : ወውሉዶ : ወአጋዊሁ : ወዔሳውሃ : ኢያቅረቦ :  
 ጎቤሁ : እግዚአብሔር : ወኢጎረዮ : ቦሙ : እስመ : እምውሉደ :  
 አብርሃም : እሙንቱ : እስመ : አእመሮሙ : ወእስራኤልሃ : ጎረዮ :  
 ይኩንዎ : ሕዝብ : ወቀደሶ : ወአስተጋብአ : እምኩሉ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ ::

[JCVK] For the Lord did not draw near to himself either Ishmael, his sons, his brothers, or Esau. He did not choose them (simply) because they were among Abraham's children, for he knew them. But he chose Israel to be his people. 15:31 He sanctified them and gathered (them) from all mankind. (Jubilees 15:30-31)

Although chapter 23 does not use the language of election, one certainly finds in 2:20 that the election will not expire (see also 22:9-10).

ወጎረዳኩ : በዘርአ : ያዕቆብ : በኩሉ : እምዘርኢኩ : ወጸሐፍክዎ : ሊተ :  
 ወልደ : በኩረ : ወቀደስክዎ : ሊተ : ለዓለመ : ዓለም ::

[JCVK] I have chosen the descendants of Jacob among all of those whom I have seen. I have recorded them as my first-born son and have sanctified them for myself throughout the ages of eternity. (Jubilees 2:20)

ובחר בזרע יעקוב ב[כל מאשר ראיתי וכתבתי אתו לי לבן בכור וקדשתי אתו לי]  
 (4QJub<sup>a</sup> VII:11-12) לעולם ועד

The same is true when we turn to related language. The phrase “righteous plant” refers to *all* of Israel in Jubilees 1:16; 16:26; 21:24; and 36:6. Jubilees 21:24 is particularly interesting because the language resonates with the typical language of the apocalypses, but the context establishes a meaning which is contrary to the meaning in the apocalypses.

ወያነሥእ : እምኔክ : ተክለ : ጽድቅ : በኩሉ : ምድር : በኩሉ : ጎውልደ :  
 ምድር

[JCVK] [God] will raise from you [Isaac] a righteous plant [Jacob] in all the earth throughout all the history of the earth. (Jubilees 21:24)

(4QJub<sup>f</sup> 1:7-8) וְהָקִים מִמֶּךָּ מִטַּעַת הָאָמֶת בְּאֶרֶץ לְכוֹל דּוֹר[וֹת הָאָרֶץ]

If such a sentence were uncovered as a fragment one might not guess that the righteous plant is the entire people of Israel, but in the context of an address to Isaac and the clear tendency throughout Jubilees, the language takes on an unexpected meaning. Finally, Jubilees often uses words like “all” in phrases such as “all of them will be called children of the living God” (Jubilees 1:25), “all Jacob’s children” (1:28), “may all your [Jacob’s] descendents become blessed and holy descendents” (25:18). Jubilees uses strong language for the unity of Israel, but before making a strong conclusion we should consider one moderating point and one exception.

Jubilees emphasizes that the category “Israel” has singular and eternal significance in the classification of humanity. The emphasis on “all” suggests that the entire nation will eternally enjoy that status. Jubilees does not single out a group within Israel for eschatological reward or condemnation. This position is moderated by the fact that some individuals may sin and be punished with death. For example, in 30:22, individual Israelites who violate the covenant are subject to being erased from the book of the living and recorded as enemies, subject to *כרת*. Yet, it is precisely because they remain under the covenant that they are punished under the covenant. As we shall see when we read Jubilees 23 for the temporal axis, Jubilees does not view the covenantal curses as an unexercised threat. The covenantal relationship between God and all of Israel is not reconsidered. The potential for individual Israelites to sin and be cut off moderates but does not negate the overwhelming emphasis on the election of all Israel.

Also, the elevation of Levi might be considered an exception to the rejection of division within Israel, but the major differences are that this group designation is



traditional and in received scripture, and the role of the group is not eschatological.<sup>91</sup> The scope of the dissertation does not justify a lengthy discussion as to whether Jubilees participates in polemic between priestly groups. Although it is true that Jubilees does not make clear reference to Zadok and says less than one might expect of Aaron and Phinehas,<sup>92</sup> the simplest explanation is that the status of the Aaronides over the Levites was not hotly contested, and Jubilees focuses on the narrative setting before the establishment of the cult.<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, the acknowledgement of the traditional role of the sons of Levi but the lack of additional privilege supports the present point that Jubilees emphasizes the unity of Israel.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> For more on Levi in Jubilees see Section 7.10 below.

<sup>92</sup> Phinehas is not mentioned by name, but the expansion of the zeal of Levi for purity and endogamy is clearly modeled on Phinehas. See Numbers 25 and Jubilees 30.

<sup>93</sup> Scholars since Wellhausen have traced the tumultuous history of priestly groups from the rise of professional priests to the late and disputed familial distinctions of Levites, Aaronide Priests, and High Priests. Although disputes about priestly status frequently occurred, some scholars have overestimated the extent to which the pre-exilic disputes extended into the second century BCE. As early as the Chronicler, and certainly by the mid second century BCE in Jerusalem's priestly circles, the ascending status of all Israel, Levites, and priests (if not the high priesthood) had ceased to be hotly disputed. Thus, the fact that Jubilees elevates Levi is primarily a function of the ancestral time period in which the book is set. Although Aaron might have appeared more at the end of the book, the decision not to develop further the establishment of the priestly cult is not a snub on Aaron or propaganda for a pan-Levitical priesthood. Even more so, the lack of a "prediction" of the distinction of Phinehas or Zadok can be explained by the overwhelming tendency to stay in the narrative setting, with only general predictive passages. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Edinburgh A. & C. Black, 1885; reprint, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 121-151. Saul M. Olyan, "Zadok's Origins and the Tribal Politics of David," *JBL* 101, no. 2 (1982): 177-193. Olyan, "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," 261-286. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Judaeon Priesthood During the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: A Hypothetical Reconstruction," *CBQ* 60, no. 1 (1998): 25-43. Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 146-192. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973), 195-215. Gary N. Knoppers, "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood," *JBL* 118, no. 1 (1999): 49-72. Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 456-459.

<sup>94</sup> The special status of Levi may keep us from talking about *equality* of all Israel in Jubilees, but we can still talk about *unity*. In the second century BCE the voices for abolishing any hierarchical distinctions were the voices against unity, and the voices for the traditional categories were the voices for unity.

Again, the narrative setting may partly explain some of the emphasis on the unity of Israel, but again the true views come out in the eschatological hopes. Thus we turn to Jubilees 23. The first key to understanding groups in chapter 23 is that בניִים is not necessarily a technical term for a particular and defined group of Jews in the second century BCE. If this is part of a pattern of allusion or similarity to the Animal Apocalypse, or a particular group behind the Animal Apocalypse and Damascus Document, one must look past the term and consider whether similar things are said about the בניִים in each case. Even within chapter 23, scholars have mistakenly identified the two uses of the term as references to the same group, despite the different actions and evaluations associated with them.<sup>95</sup> Jubilees 23 first uses the term in verse 16 for the youths who revolt against their elders. There are no good reasons to assume that Jubilees has anything nice to say about these militants, although there are bad reasons, and good reasons to think the opposite.<sup>96</sup> Jubilees 23:16-21 refers to a Jewish civil war, punished by God in 23:22-25. Even if one accusation or another applies to one side and not the other, neither side is right. Nothing good is said about either side, and nothing good comes of the fighting. The repeated use of “all” and the inclusive plural pronouns (“they”) include all participants in the civil war. When God intervenes, God punishes both sides. Contrary to the Animal Apocalypse, the “Day of the Lord” is no vindication for militants. The בניִים who appear in

---

<sup>95</sup> Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 49-50. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 166.

<sup>96</sup> Collins suggested that the reference to the children who take up arms in Jubilees 23:16 “is ambivalent at best, and may be read as disapproving.” John J. Collins, “Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick, and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 53.

Jubilees 23:26 are the exact opposite in action and in consequence.<sup>97</sup> Rather than fighting, they study the laws. Rather than bringing on the wrath of God, they bring on the blessings of God. Even if we entertain the possibility that they are the same people reformed, the transformation of group identity is so radical as to prohibit a simple identification.<sup>98</sup> The relationship between the function of the children in 23:26 and the children in 23:16 is a relationship of strong contrast.<sup>99</sup> If anything is to be made of the repeated terminology, it is an accentuated contrast.

Remarkably, Jubilees does not single out any groups within Israel for special punishment or reward. In as much as there is a tension between collective guilt and punishment versus individual guilt and punishment, Jubilees 23 favors the side of collective. Although one might get the sense that the Jews who die fighting each other deserve what they get (23:20), vindictiveness is lacking in the war account, and especially the punishment and restoration accounts. The initial phase of punishment or covenantal curse comes as a famine, with the emphasis that all, not only the militants on both sides, suffer (23:18). The “great punishment from the Lord” applies to everyone

---

<sup>97</sup> Collins also notes that 23:26 need not refer to a specific group within Israel, nor be identified with the militant group in 23:16. Ibid. This should be taken as a correction to a conflation in an earlier work, “the ‘children’ who begin to study the laws and rise up and drive out their adversaries can be plausibly identified with the Hasidim or a wing of that party.” Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 83. To be precise, God drives out the enemies, after God drove them in as a result of the “children” rising up. The children who study in 23:26 do not drive out enemies.

<sup>98</sup> One might argue that verse 26 describes a reform of the same basic party, but even if that is the case, it is more a reconstitution than a reform. Presumably the pietistic militants considered themselves faithful to the law. If Jubilees were referring to the same group, it would be denying any legitimacy, not only to their militancy, but to their former adherence to scripture by saying, “They will *begin* to study the laws, seek out the commands and return to the right way.”

<sup>99</sup> If one wished to speak exhaustively about “children” in the sequence, one would also consider 23:18, which explicitly blames the children of men (ወ-ሉድ : ሰብእ, presumably בני אדם) for the plague, and 23:25, which describes the curse of the children (ጹቂቶ). These points illustrate further that “children” is not a technical term for a particular group.

(23:22). Even more explicitly, the armies God sends to punish Israel will “show partiality to no one.” What is truly remarkable, however, is the lack of judgment or vindictiveness in the eschatological restoration. The “enemies” who are expelled in 23:30 are best understood as the foreign armies who had been sent in as punishment. The eschatological hope for foreigners is not vindictive punishment, submission, or incorporation, but simply, “go home.”<sup>100</sup> The restoration restores the national boundaries laid out with care in Jubilees 9. While Israel enjoys its covenantal blessings, the other nations continue to experience the “curses” of normal life specified earlier in the chapter. Jubilees does not dwell on vengeance against foreigners, much less a group within Israel.

Likewise, on the other side, those who began the trend of studying the laws are not mentioned again for special reward. The reversal of the pattern in lifespan applies to everyone (23:27), as did the decrease. There is a mild discussion of things being made right for righteous individuals, but two observations are essential. First, neither God’s “servants” nor “the righteous” are a group; they do not refer back to any group or actions previously discussed. They are a class of individuals described by an attribute. The idea that God rewards righteous individuals is hardly sectarian polemic. Second, even if one takes 23:30 as a form of resurrection, which is hardly necessary,<sup>101</sup> the resurrected are only awakened long enough to see that everything turned out alright. Then they return to resting in peace (23:31). We should not insist on binary positions on the afterlife in

---

<sup>100</sup> This is true of the eschatological framework in Jubilees 23. In other contexts one does find the idea of other nations serving Israel (Jubilees 22:11; 38:14).

<sup>101</sup> It is not explicit that those who rise had been dead. The verb “to rise” could refer to any improvement in situation. The preceding verb, “to heal,” may suggest reversal of death, but could be any suffering. Perhaps the best solution is to leave the ambiguity intact. The general emphasis of the context is not the replacement of death with eternal life, but the replacement of violent and unnatural death with peaceful death in very old age.

second century BCE Jewish thought. Sirach attests the idea of a good or bad death, but not an afterlife *per se*.<sup>102</sup> Jubilees does not say much more than that those who suffered a bad death unjustly will be set right so they can rest in peace. Certainly no one is becoming a luminary or enjoying eternal, unimaginable bliss. Finally, the “kindness” in 23:31 is not limited to an elite organization but shown to “hundreds and thousands and to all who love God.” The eschatological punishments and rewards, such as they may be, are not the vindication of a separatist group, but the restoration of an idealized past. The category “Israel” continues to be the only meaningful category for the classification of humanity, and its separation, intended from creation, finally becomes realized in the expulsion of foreigners and restoration of boundaries. *Contra* Testuz, Collins has noted that Jubilees lacks a group designation such as “chosen righteous.”<sup>103</sup> In my estimation, the evidence permits a conclusion that Jubilees not only lacks but rejects a group designation within Israel, other than the traditional priestly categories.

This sub-section has shown some significant differences between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. Even if the issue of human classification is not necessarily implied by the use of the genre “apocalypse,” and even if the apocalypses do not form a coherent cluster of views on the status of other nations in the future restoration, some major contrasts are evident. Contemporary apocalypses consistently qualify or reject the significance of the category “Israel.” Often enough, the category dissolves and foreign nations are incorporated in some way. Jubilees rejects this possibility. The apocalypses

---

<sup>102</sup> Sirach 1:12-13 (10-11); 11:26-28; 30:4-6; 41:1-13.

<sup>103</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 74.

are more consistent on the elevation of a new group within Israel, particularly in eschatological contexts. The eschatological hope for the author of Jubilees is not that the author or author's group would rule over Israel or be singled out for salvation, but that they would provide the model by which the entire nation would be restored and united. Even though there is not consistency in the apocalypses on the issue of human classification, they do cluster together in a basic perspective. Jubilees addresses the issues but does not share the perspective.<sup>104</sup>

### 5.2.2. Violence

In the previous section we saw samples of how views of group definition can extend to violence, and how Jubilees 23 opposes the Jewish civil war. When we focus on the issue of violence in this section we find a number of moderating factors on both sides. Yet it remains the case that the apocalypses, with all their diversity, stand together on some form of an endorsement of violence. Jubilees, in contrast, frequently reflects a principled aversion to violence, especially violence between Jews. Three major moderating factors and two methodological caveats should be considered from the outset.

First, we can say empirically that violence is typically addressed in contemporary apocalypses, but it is not part of the definition of the literary genre, nor does a worldview necessarily follow from the illocution. Many sources that do not use the genre "apocalypse" also develop divine violence, human violence, or divine violence through

---

<sup>104</sup> A more thorough study would also consider the Testament of Moses, although it is not an apocalypse and not uniformly contemporary. There may be interesting affinities with Jubilees in the idea that membership among the Jewish people and observance of the law are decisive, and that righteousness and disobedience are personal attributes, not groups.

human agency.<sup>105</sup> Nevertheless, it is not a coincidence that the apocalypses bring a twist to the relationship between human and cosmic violence. One might argue this from social psychology if one develops the idea that apocalypse is the genre of choice for the marginalized and alienated. One could also argue that the spatial axis imposes a cosmic significance to human action, even when all obvious factors suggest insignificance and the chain of cause and effect cannot be seen from human perspective. Thus, the illocution of the genre amplifies the significance of individual human action beyond the scope of mundane reality. Typically, the apocalypses amplify human violence and facilitation of violence to cosmic proportions. Jubilees, in contrast, amplifies the significance of non-militant religious observance.<sup>106</sup>

Second, we should be clear that the apocalypses offer vastly different interpretations of *how* the call to violence plays out. The Animal Apocalypse expresses a relatively practical hope of human armies inspiring an angel and God to join the battle. The hope Daniel articulates is less practical (or more realistic, depending on how one looks at it) in that the decision to stand up to evil will not be efficacious in the short term. Daniel emphasizes the efficaciousness of non-human intervention. One should not, however, miss the endorsement of violence in Daniel, or the eschatological hope of those who die in battle. Even Daniel, and certainly other apocalypses, include violence in their earthly call to action and supernatural hopes.

---

<sup>105</sup> See, for example, 2 Kings 6:16-17.

<sup>106</sup> Although one can rightly speak of “determinism” in the apocalyptic worldview, it should not be overstated as to diminish the function of legitimizing a call to action. That which is determined highlights by elimination that which remains to be determined.

Third, we should not portray Jubilees as a predecessor to Gandhi in principled opposition to all forms of violence. Jubilees assesses positively the biblical wars of the patriarchs, even where the Pentateuch left ambiguity. Also, in the judgments of individual nations, which differ from the eschatological scenario of Jubilees 23, Jubilees extends the idea of violent destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah to the destruction of other nations (past or future). However, one should not be quick to assume that Jubilees presents the wars of the patriarchs as models to be replicated, or God as judging nations through the armies of Israel.

Finally, two lesser issues should be noted. First, the critical reader needs to look past the double standard of “violence is always righteous when I do it and always wicked when others do it.” We are not comparing the views of the violence of other nations (although it is interesting that Jubilees portrays foreign armies as divine punishment). Nor should we only focus on interpretation of particular historical events. As much as is possible, we should investigate the views of violence in principle. Second, it is certainly true that Jubilees writes from a different historical perspective on the Jewish civil war. I am not denying that historical retrospect partly explains the more critical view of Jubilees and the more optimistic view of the Animal Apocalypse, nor am I comparing Jubilees to less critical retrospectives (1-2 Maccabees). The point here is *that* Jubilees differs in its evaluation of violence, not *why* Jubilees differs.

We will introduce the discussion again with a sample of Third Isaiah. We will then consider the contemporary readings of earlier apocalypses, then the contemporary apocalypses. We will consider Daniel carefully, noting how it differs from Enochic apocalypses, but emphasizing the remaining positive value of violence. Finally, we will



consider how violence can continue to be justified in Jubilees, but becomes qualified within the framework of a worldview that is critical of violence.

#### 5.2.2.1. Third Isaiah

Again, we mention Third Isaiah not because it is exclusively relevant among the older non-apocalypses, but because it is especially relevant. A sample of the vindictive violence can be seen in Isaiah 63:3 and 66:16.

פֹּרְחָה | דְּרָכָתִי לְבָדִי וּמַעֲמִים אֵין-אִישׁ אֲתִי וְאֶדְרָכֶם בְּאִפִּי וְאֶרְמָסֶם בְּחִמָּתִי  
(Isaiah 63:3) וַיֵּז נִצָּחֶם עַל-בִּגְדֵי וְכָל-מַלְבוּשֵׁי אֶגְאוֹלָתִי:

(Isaiah 66:16) כִּי בָאֵשׁ יְהוָה נִשְׁפָּט וּבְחַרְבּוֹ אֶת-כָּל-בָּשָׂר וְרַבּוֹ תִלְלִי יְהוָה:

The agency is exclusively divine, but the agency is especially violent. Other passages are more clearly understood as violent hopes against other Jews (e.g., 57:12-13). Violence is not the exclusive domain of the apocalypses, but again, scholars have studied with good cause the relationship between Third Isaiah and the apocalypses.

#### 5.2.2.2. The Enochic apocalypses

The earliest apocalypses differ in that they were apparently written at a time when the perceived conflicts were relatively bloodless, or at least less immediate. We do not find specific evaluation of the Jewish civil war, but we do find a positive assessment of violence. The most obvious assessment of violence in these works set before the flood comes out in the explanation of the flood. Any account of a universal flood, including the Genesis account, is necessarily violent, but the Genesis account is notoriously vague on causality. The early Enochic works “justify” the flood as vengeance against sinners.

Thus, although the Astronomical Book does not dwell on the matter, we read, “the apostate will drown with the apostate” (81:8). The interest in the flood came to be the idea that the past obliteration of sinners was a model for a forthcoming obliteration. Thus, the violent judgment is typologically past but eschatologically future. It is true that Enoch and Noah do not appear as warriors,<sup>107</sup> but the early Enoch apocalypses do lend themselves to a homologous interpretation of angelic and human violence. If the past angelic vengeance did not *require* human participation in the imminent fulfillment of the type (*imitatio angelorum*), it certainly did not prohibit it, as evident in apocalypses that build on the early traditions with specific calls to human violence.

The apocalypses closer to the time of Jubilees dispel any doubt as to whether God commissions humans to take vengeance on humans, just as God commissions angels to take vengeance on angels. The heroes of the Animal Apocalypse can be identified as a historical army, and in 90:19 that army will be given a big sword to go out and kill “all the wild beasts” (including other Jews, the wild sheep of 90:16).<sup>108</sup> Similarly, in the Apocalypse of Weeks a sword is given to the righteous to execute judgment on the wicked and pillage (91:12-13). If the rest of the Epistle is later, it is all the more striking that its graphic images of violence may have developed outside the context of reaction to wartime events. For example, the Epistle of Enoch 98:12 reads,

---

<sup>107</sup> Enoch reprimands regarding vengeance that will come, but does not execute judgment himself (Book of the Watchers 13:8). A positive assessment of vengeance is clear even when the role of humans in the typology is unclear.

<sup>108</sup> This applies to the Animal Apocalypse as we have it, not the version that may have existed prior to a pro-Maccabean revision. The latest study to isolate references to the Maccabean crisis from the rest of the work is Daniel Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85-90): une propagande militaire?: Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques*, JSJSup 120 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007).

[GWEN] Now be it known to you that you will be delivered into the hands of the righteous, and they will cut off your necks, and they will kill you and not spare you. (Epistle of Enoch 98:12)

Human agency has come a long way. One might find a sadistic tinge in the punishment in 95:3 and 96:1, “as you desire.” We have at least two contemporary apocalypses and a roughly contemporary apocalypse that establish the extreme of historical and anticipated human violence against other humans, including Jews.

#### 5.2.2.3. The Danielic apocalypses

If one were only comparing Daniel and the Enochic apocalypses one would rightly find significant differences to emphasize. When one adds Jubilees to the consideration, however, one finds at the level of worldview that Daniel and the Enochic apocalypses stand together in ways that Jubilees stands apart. The crux of the prescribed human action is Daniel 11:32-35, but first some other tendencies in the compilation should be considered. A form of the phrase “not by human hand” appears in Daniel 2:34, 45; and 8:25 (cf. 11:45). Similarly, Daniel 7:11 implies no human action in the slaying of the beast (even the human-like figure appears only after the beast is slain). In the final apocalypse the human action prescribed in 11:32-35 does not bring about immediate victory in earthly terms. Consistently in Daniel, the cosmic feats are left to cosmic forces. Daniel has no illusions that the Maccabean soldiers, even with their angelophanies, will bring about the desired victory.

In terms of practical expectations, Daniel departs from the pro-Maccabean texts. In terms of worldview, however, we do not find a critique of empire, violence, or armed human action. In Daniel 2 the means to restoring the kingdom of Israel is supernatural,

but it is still a violent kingdom that will shatter all other kingdoms (Daniel 2:44).

Similarly, Daniel 7 looks to transfer, not abolish, dominion and empire. Indestructible is not the same as peaceful. Even with the emphasis on supernatural agency and angelic representation of the nation of Israel, Daniel 7 does not anticipate a day when humans cease to lord over others. The *means* shift to supernatural intervention, but the anticipated end is basically victory in terms of earthly empire, not a utopian vision of peace and universal direct governance by God.

Before coming to the crux of normative human response in Daniel 11:32-35, we should mention Daniel 11:14.

וּבְעֵתֵי הָהֵם רַבִּים יַעֲמְדוּ עַל-מֶלֶךְ הַנִּגָּב וּבְנֵי פְרִיצֵי עֵמָךְ יִשְׁאָזוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חָזֹן  
וְנִכְשָׁלוּ:

[JJC] In those times many will rise against the king of the south, and the violent ones of your people will raise themselves to fulfill the vision, but they will stumble. (Daniel 11:14)

Whether the anti-Ptolemaic group was pro-Seleucid or pro-independence, we find a negative evaluation both in the language used to describe them (בני פריצי עמד), and in their efficaciousness (נכשלו). Although visions were given military significance at other times (e.g. Animal Apocalypse 90:14; 2 Macc 3:25; 11:8), we cannot specifically identify this group.<sup>109</sup> This is a negative assessment of a militant uprising, but it is not the last word on human resistance.

Between the review of past history and the anticipation of future events, Daniel 11 offers only a few verses of explicit guidance on what humans should do in the present. We should distinguish “those who know their God” אֱלֹהֵי יָדְעֵי, and “the wise ones”

---

<sup>109</sup> See Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 380.

משכילי עַם.<sup>110</sup> They are obviously on the same side, but they have different descriptions, functions, and fates. The latter are a sub-category of the former. All the knowledgeable resist, but only one role in the resistance is teaching (we shall return to whether fighting is also a legitimate role in the resistance). First, the term המשכילים is stronger than היודעים, suggesting a more elite sub-group. Second, the actions are different. We should not imagine that only wisdom teachers knew their God and “stood up.” It makes more sense if a broader class stood up to resist in a variety of ways, and only a sub-class was devoted to teaching. Third, the fate of the general class and sub-class are treated differently, both here and in 12:2-3. It is true that the verb “fall” is used for both, but 11:35 is redundant if we flatten any distinction of sub-class. The other verbs are distinct. In 12:2-3 the רבים are simply resurrected, but the משכילים are elevated to become luminaries.

To summarize, the general category of those on the correct side is called “those who know their God” and “the multitude.” They stand firm and take action (יִחָזְקוּ וְעָשׂוּ), and receive proper instruction. They suffer sword, flame, captivity and plunder, and receive little help from some insincere ones. Afterwards, they will rise to everlasting life. The more specific sub-category among those on the right side refers to those who are devoted to teaching wisdom (theologians for the cause, if you will). They are mostly called משכילים, and described as מְצַדִּיקֵי הָרַבִּים in 12:3. They will teach the multitude, and like the multitude some of them fall, but for them it serves a different function, to refine, purify and whiten them. Afterwards they become like stars forever.

---

<sup>110</sup> For a different view see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 111.

Now we consider the likelihood that fighting was part of the prescribed resistance. The verbs חזק and עשה may not specify military action, but they do not preclude it, and the fate of this resistance movement suggests that they had been doing more than praying in their attics. Daniel 6:10 and 2 Maccabees may portray the least confrontational forms of piety as magnets for wicked persecutors, but other sources and historical probability suggest that martyrdom came first to the soldiers. Thus, while the martyrs of 1 Maccabees 2 were killed while they refused to fight on the sabbath, it is most likely that they were being chased in the desert because of their eagerness to fight on the other six days. Only if a group is organized for a purpose can it be defeated, helped or joined (11:34). Military struggle is the most likely of the possibilities. Although there is not as much clarity as we might like on the action taken by the masses, the more important point is the basic worldview that violence is salvific. Violence is not efficacious in military terms, but it is not a vain or sinful effort either (as it is in Jubilees). Enduring violence is salvific, and it at least seems likely that violent resistance was advocated, even if the only expectation was to prove fidelity and draw martyrdom.

We should not assume that the group which produced Daniel 10-12 is described in 1-2 Maccabees or any other text. Daniel does not take a high view of Judah Maccabee, and certainly not of Antiochus Epiphanes, but this does not reduce the possibilities to quietism. The apocalypse was not composed with a sword in the hand, but the balance of evidence suggests that the group of wisdom teachers with which the author identified taught and supported armed resistance. Although they did not expect military resistance to be efficacious in a practical and immediate sense prior to divine intervention at the appointed time, and they reserved the highest reward for themselves, they did promise the fallen fighters everlasting life (Daniel 12:2). Even in a cosmic crisis the decision of the

individual still matters, not because one can determine history but because one can determine one's own eternal life. Despite the many differences from the Animal Apocalypse, at the level of worldview, Daniel shares a favorable view of cosmic violence and promotes human participation therein.

#### 5.2.2.4. Jubilees

In subtle ways, Jubilees reflects a worldview that is critical of violence. Jubilees is not written as a principled critique of violence, and other factors, such as justification of the patriarchs, easily trump this interest. Yet, one finds various comments throughout Jubilees that suggest a worldview opposed to violence. Again, one finds the worldview reflected most truly in the eschatological hopes. Jubilees 23 includes violence in the sin and punishment phase, but the repentance and restoration phases are marked by the absence of violent resistance, conquest or vindication by any agents. First we will look at some of the positive portrayals of violence that must moderate any conclusions, and then we will look at the critical passages and evaluate the relationship between the competing interests. The data can be understood as a non-violent worldview in which isolated instances of violence may be necessary as a last resort.

Jubilees is not a statement of the author's personal philosophy. The author is constrained by received scripture, theological and exegetical principles, and historical context. The worldview comes out in how the author navigates these constraints. To be sure, normative violence appears in Genesis, and even ambiguous violence at the hands of patriarchs becomes normative in Jubilees. Thus, not only do we see Abraham fighting against Chedorlaomer (Jubilees 13:25), we find Jacob's reservations in the Pentateuch

about the slaughter of Shechem resolved as emphatically justified in heaven (30:23).

There is no downplaying the fact that the interests in Jubilees in justifying biblical heroes, elevating Levi in particular, and condemning exogamy take precedence over any skepticism about the efficaciousness of armed aggression. In this context we read the most favorable portrayal of violence in Jubilees,

ወኮነቶሙ ፡ ጽድቀ ፡ ወተጽሕፎሙ ፡ ለጽድቅ ፡፡ ወተኅርየ ፡ ዘርአ ፡ ሌዊ ፡  
ለክህነት ፡ ወለሌዋዊያን ፡ ከመ ፡ ይትለእኩ ፡ ቅድመ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡  
ከመ ፡ ንሕነ ፡ በኩሉ ፡ መዋዕል ፡፡ ወይትባረክ ፡ ሌዊ ፡ ወውሉዱ ፡ ለዓለም ፡  
እስመ ፡ ቀንኦ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይግበር ፡ ጽድቀ ፡ ወኩነኔ ፡ ወበቀለ ፡ እምኩሎሙ ፡  
እለ ፡ ይትነሥኡ ፡ ላዕለ ፡ እስራኤል

[JCVK] It [the slaughter of Shechem] was a just act for them [Levi and Simeon] and was recorded as a just act for them. Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel. (Jubilees 30:17-18)

Jubilees identifies the issue and the outcome with Numbers 25, where Phinehas acts violently against exogamy<sup>111</sup> and receives a blessing for it. Even for a Jewish author not aligned with priestly interests, the justification of Phinehas was not in question. Jubilees' endorsement of Phinehas is hardly, however, an endorsement of any historical figure who invoked Phinehas to justify killing other Jews (1 Macc 2:26, 54).<sup>112</sup> The author neither denied nor avoided the positive evaluation of biblical violence. Jubilees is not a radical and principled rejection of all violence, yet we will see how Jubilees works the non-

---

<sup>111</sup> Jubilees 30:7-16 emphasizes that the problem which Levi addressed was exogamy, not the rape of twelve-year-old girls.

<sup>112</sup> The violence of Levi and Phinehas is normative but not prescriptive. Any individual Jew who carries out revenge could not expect to be blessed with an eternal priesthood, at least as far as Jubilees is concerned. I do not mean to suggest that Jubilees directly engages arguments for the Hasmonean priesthood, only that it gives no indications of supporting that kind of argument. Modern readers should be careful not to mistake, based on later developments, an interpretation of Genesis and Numbers for political propaganda.



negotiable instances of just violence into a worldview that is critical of violent approaches.

The other set of moderating data is the judgment of nations. The next chapter will show that Jubilees does not follow other apocalypses in the view that all the nations and the cosmos are to be judged at once. Every nation faces judgment, but judgment happens in historical, not eschatological, time. It is important to distinguish eschatological violence from historical violence when studying the core hope and worldview, but historical violence is violence nonetheless. In some cases it is questionable whether Jubilees is venting violent hatred against a nation, or explaining how it happened that a biblical enemy of Israel has ceased to exist by the second century BCE (e.g., the Amorites in Jubilees 29:11, see 6.6.2). Jubilees 24 involves complicated issues of the texts and interpretation of Genesis, other received writings on the Philistines, and contemporary attitudes and events, but the bottom line is clear. The Philistines were to be eradicated. Whether past (Babel, Sodom and Gomorrah, Amorites), contemporary (apparently the Philistines), or future, Jubilees is not reluctant to imagine that whole nations would be eradicated for their ancestral and collective sins. This is not a vision of universal peace and tolerance,<sup>113</sup> but neither is it military propaganda. Jubilees does not challenge traditional national enmity, but the agents for the judgment of nations are God and other nations.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> Even making peace takes the form of imposing tribute in 34:9 and 38:12.

<sup>114</sup> Only in Jubilees 24:29 would one have to consider seriously the possibility that Jubilees endorses a Jewish army eradicating a population. This likely reflects a historical reality that some Jewish forces made war on some traditionally Philistine cities, and Jubilees is certainly not sorry about that. (See Charles, *Jubilees*, 154-155.) Yet it remains striking that this brief allusion appears in the context of a lengthy emphasis on a much larger program for the judgment of the Philistines. The passage emphasizes the ancestral curse recorded on the heavenly tablets, the majority action of the Greeks and Antiochus in

The justification of biblical wars and the expectation that the enemies of Israel did or would share the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah moderate the extent to which we can speak of a non-violent worldview in Jubilees. Relative to its day and relative to other apocalypses, however, a number of contrasts on the level of worldview are striking. Jubilees accepts the occasional necessity of war and violent justice, but leans in the direction of skepticism toward the efficacy of violence. First, but not least, we will consider two negative comments on the etiology of warfare. Second, we will consider the prohibition of fighting on the sabbath, which amounts to a prohibition of joining an army in the first place. Third, we will consider the frequent discussions that reflect a concern with and opposition to fraternal strife. Finally, we shall return to Jubilees 23, which condemns the Jewish civil war and imagines a restoration without violent retribution by anyone against anyone.

The first point can bear little weight in light of the frequent tendency to condemn the warfare of others while celebrating one's own. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that in two places Jubilees identifies the origin and nature of warfare as demonic. In Jubilees 11:2-5 demons inspire idolaters to shed blood, and in 5:9 the first civil war occurs between the giants. Obviously the defensive actions of the patriarchs are not demonic. Even if demons drive idolaters to initiate wars, the patriarchs are justified in fighting back. Even for its day it is not a strong position to say that wicked ones start wars and righteous people defend themselves. It does, however, fit a tendency to view war as no more than a necessary evil.

---

particular (to explain the singular nouns in Jubilees 24:28), and the more supernatural eternal curse described in the poetic section.

Second, and more significantly, the legal ruling in Jubilees prohibiting fighting on the sabbath amounts to a prohibition of joining an army in the first place, at least when the enemy does not share the principle. Very early in the revolt religious militants realized that fighting on six days and resting on the sabbath was not a viable option. After the events described in 1 Maccabees 2, it became clear that soldiers had to be prepared either to fight on the sabbath or face martyrdom. Jubilees does not develop the idea of martyrdom (or related ideas of vicarious suffering or innocent blood forcing God to act), resurrection, or an afterlife other than resting in peace. We may therefore conclude that Jubilees was promoting a third option: do not be a soldier. Common sense and 1 Maccabees 2 establish that a soldier who refuses to fight on the sabbath will die, and Jubilees 50:13 establishes that a soldier who does fight on the sabbath will die. The ruling amounts to a prohibition against being a militant.<sup>115</sup>

The third point is striking not so much in content as in the number of occasions on which it is emphasized. Jubilees, writing in the wake of a civil war, repeatedly condemns fraternal strife and praises fraternal harmony, both within Israel and with Ishmael and Esau. Skipping past the more general cases (Cain and Abel, the self-destructive war of the giants), in Jubilees 20:2 Abraham proposes alliance and unity not only between the descendents of Isaac and Ishmael, but also all the sons of Keturah. In 42:25 Joseph tests for “peaceful thoughts” between his brothers, and in 46:1-2 Israelite unity is equated with prosperity and lack of satans or evil ones. The relationship between Jacob and Esau is

---

<sup>115</sup> One might also consider the ruling against bloodshed in Jubilees 6:8. One might argue that here Jubilees is simply following Genesis 9:6, but just because Genesis said it does not mean the author of Jubilees did not believe it. One might also argue that shedding blood refers to murder but not war, but shedding blood on the earth does refer to war in Jubilees 23:20.

naturally much more complicated, but Jubilees continually emphasizes the ideal of fraternal harmony.<sup>116</sup> The ideal of brotherly love between Jacob and Esau is emphasized in 35:20; 36:4, 11 and so forth. The subsequent chapters develop, as literature does, the tensions and drama in such a tenuous relationship across a number of conflicting characters. The resolution reveals the perspective of the author of Jubilees. Despite his ups and downs, Esau himself comes off relatively well. The blame for the history of tension shifts to his sons, which creates an opening for the later descendents to return to their original roots of reconciling with Israel. Jacob finally recognizes the necessity of self-defense, even against his brother, but regrets the situation and commands mercy,

ወለአኩ ፡ ኀበ ፡ አቡሆሙ ፡ እመ ፡ ይገብሩ ፡ ሰላመ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡  
ወለእመ ፡ ይቀትልዎሙ ፡ ። ወለአኩ ፡ ያዕቆብ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ውሉዱ ፡ ከመ ፡  
ይግበሩ ፡ ሰላመ

[JCVK] They sent to their father (to ask) whether they should make peace with them or kill them. Jacob sent word to his sons to make peace.  
(Jubilees 38:11-12)

Peace takes the form of tribute. Perhaps the constraint of contemporary circumstance appears again. On the literary level, Jubilees promotes the ideal of fraternal harmony between the descendents of Jacob and Esau. In light of the tensions and conflicts known to have existed in the second century, the moderate (but not absolute) conciliatory tone of Jubilees is all the more striking.

Finally, we return to Jubilees 23 from the perspective of attitudes towards violence. We have already seen that Jubilees 23 condones none of the factions fighting in

---

<sup>116</sup> Doron Mendels attempted to explain these chapters in terms of the political situation at the time of composition. I agree with his basic observation that Jubilees promotes the idea of alliance, although I would emphasize the extent to which Jubilees is concerned with the issues in Genesis rather than particular current events. Mendels, *Land of Israel as a Political Concept*, 57-88.

the civil war. Closely related is the fact that Jubilees views the “shedding of much blood” not as a glorious thing but as an inherently wicked thing that arouses punishment from God. Fighting, regardless of intentions, is neither righteous nor efficacious,

ወይቀውሙ : በአስይፍት : ወበቀትል : ከመ : ይሚጥዎሙ : ውስተ :  
ፍኖት : ወኢይትመየጡ : እስከ : ይትከፀው : ደም : ብዙኅ : ዲበ : ምድር :  
እሉ : በእሉ

[JCVK] They will stand up with swords and warfare in order to bring them back to the way; but they will not be brought back until<sup>117</sup> much blood is shed on the earth by each group. (Jubilees 23:20)

The closest Jubilees 23 comes to a positive view of violence (but still not very positive) is the foreign nations who invade Israel, since they are at least doing the will of God (23:22). The point is not that those who are fighting are sinful; the point is that fighting is sinful. Nothing good comes from any of the fighting. The only human agents of salvation are those who repent and study the laws. This virtue does not lead them to military victory. Even God, who takes on the entire remaining agency in the restoration, does not judge or punish anyone. Presumably the surviving warriors will repent and join those who have already repented and begun to study the laws properly. The closest thing to retribution is that God expels the enemies, but without violence. God had sent the nations in as punishment, now God is simply sending them home after the repentance. Separation from the nations is absolutely essential to the eschatological hope of Jubilees, but vengeance is not. Other passages discuss the judgment of individual nations, and some of them may have eschatological twists, but the core description of the eschatological

---

<sup>117</sup> In context it is clear that “until” does *not* mean that they will eventually succeed in bringing anyone back to the right way even after much blood is shed.

restoration is completely non-violent. The same is true of the other unambiguously eschatological notes, Jubilees 1:22-25; 50:5; and 19:25.

Jubilees is not radically non-violent when faced with other constraints. The eschatological hopes reveal the priorities of the author when least constrained. We need not argue that the author made a deliberate attempt to promote a systematic theology of just war; we simply observe that when left to imagine an ideal future, vengeance did not make the author's list of priorities. The author promotes peace within Israel and as much as possible with the descendants of Esau and Ishmael. In principle, self-defense can be necessary, but violent activism is neither salvific nor permissible if it conflicts with the sabbath. Judgment is a function of God, not Israel, and even then it is not always as violent as one would expect from an apocalypse. Apocalypses say different things about violence, but they typically portray violent vindication favorably, especially in the eschatological hopes. It is precisely in chapter 23 that Jubilees especially uses the genre "apocalypse," especially critiques violence as the means for humans to bring about blessing, and especially describes a non-violent vision of the future.

An apocalypse, by definition, offers a broad view of the cosmos, a perspective that can only be seen with recourse to special revelation. Apocalypses always include cosmic agents, such as angels and demons, or their domains. The broad perspective often includes a broad view of humanity with an implicit interpretation of its divisions. Sometimes the orders of humanity and the orders of cosmic forces blur together.

Typically in apocalypses, the cosmic and global forces impose on an expectation of the way things should be between an all good god and a good group of people. Cosmic

and global forces can be of mixed quality, but the significance is seen as major, and the net significance in the present is seen as negative. The agents of the cosmos are in conflict, and the orders of humanity are subject to revision and reversal. Those to whom the nature of the conflict is revealed become involved in the conflict.

In Jubilees, nothing can impose itself between Israel and God. Israel can sin by dividing against itself or intermarrying with other nations, and God can use nations to punish Israel. Yet the covenantal relationship, like the cosmos itself, remains under tight control. Angels and demons exist but have no direct significance for Israel. Other nations exist but have no wisdom that the descendants of Levi do not have, and have no power over Israel except as tools of divine punishment. The only significant agents are God and Israel. The role of Israel is to study and obey the covenant. Even before Jacob was born, even before the world was created, the order of the cosmos was established the way it will always be. Jubilees offers its own broad perspective of a cosmos tightly ordered around the eternal covenant between God and Israel. Jubilees uses the literary genre of the apocalypses to subvert the apocalyptic worldview.

## CHAPTER 6

### THE TEMPORAL AXIS

Just as apocalypses describe the agents of the cosmic drama from a broad perspective, apocalypses also describe the content or meaning of history from a broad perspective. Apocalypses situate the reader in a view of history that is not empirically obvious, and offer some expectation of the future, either directly or by extrapolation from precedent and pattern. Jubilees too provides a view of history that encompasses its beginning, its structure, its turning point, and its goal. There can be no doubt that Jubilees fits the definition of the literary genre “apocalypse,” and conveys ideas about eschatology (except in the narrowest sense of absolutely final cosmic catastrophe). When one examines what Jubilees says about the meaning of history and eschatology in particular, one finds that Jubilees does not match the worldview typically conveyed by contemporary apocalypses. Jubilees does not polemicize against apocalyptic eschatology point for point, but Jubilees consistently adapts and frequently inverts the typical ideas, with the cumulative effect of conveying a vastly different worldview.

Contemporary apocalypses typically view history in exponential deterioration and expect a radical reversal with radical reward and punishment. Jubilees 23, which most directly follows the format of the historical apocalypse, evokes the images of radical eschatology but in a framework of a gradual decline and restoration. Jubilees applies a



pattern of sin, punishment, repentance and restoration to the broadest possible view of history. Although the situation should not be reduced to apocalyptic vs. Deuteronomistic theology, the pattern of apocalyptic eschatology might be better described as sin (of others), suffering (of selves), punishment (of others), and glorification (of selves). Both Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses deal with issues of sin and punishment of Israel and the nations, but place punishment differently in the scheme of history. In Jubilees 23 Israel is punished by God according to the covenantal curses, leading to repentance and permanent restoration. Other chapters discuss the judgment of other nations, but those passages should not be simply inserted into the eschatological sequence of chapter 23 as if misplaced folios. As we shall see, the judgment of other nations is not particularly eschatological. Jubilees is an apocalypse because it deals with the larger pattern of sin and restoration in history, but not every instance of sin and punishment is eschatological.

The central issue of the temporal axis is the turning point of history. In Jubilees, the turning point is already in the past and the restoration has begun. Jubilees also differs from other apocalypses in the view of history as ordered and good from the beginning, such that it needs to be restored and fulfilled but not replaced with a new creation (or covenant, or nation, or geography, or temple, or calendar). The four sections of this chapter will consider the decline of history, the final woes, the judgment, and the restoration. On each of these issues Jubilees is comparable in that we can easily identify passages for comparison. When we carry out the comparison, however, we find that the worldview of Jubilees contrasts significantly with the worldview of its fellow apocalypses.

## 6.1. The decline of history

Apocalypses vary in the range and specific content of the transcendent view of history, but apocalypses at the time of Jubilees typically claim a perspective of the present moment as a radical break-down of the course of history. The present is neither normal nor sustainable, but a recent crisis of justice that demands immediate divine intervention. A broad perspective reveals that current wickedness is either unprecedented, or has precedent just before the flood. Either way, a moment of catastrophic judgment and salvation is imminent. Jubilees adopts not only the broad scope of history, but also the idea of a pattern of decline. What Jubilees says about the decline of history, however, differs significantly from what apocalypses typically say. In Jubilees the decline is not exponential, but gradual with most of the change in the distant past. Jubilees normalizes the course of history and takes the urgency out of the view of the present.

### 6.1.1. The Enochic apocalypses

The Book of the Watchers is a cosmic tour apocalypse, not a historical apocalypse. This limits the extent to which one can specifically stratify the decline of history from the final woes, or the restoration from the judgment. Even a cosmic tour apocalypse considers implicitly the temporal axis. The next section on the final woes will better handle the relationship between suffering and eschatological intervention. The more salient point for this section follows from the *Urzeit* typology. The Book of the Watchers does not survey all of history, but the implication is that only twice in the history of the cosmos has the situation degraded so badly that God's forces must

intervene to “reboot,” as it were. Without commenting on the period in between, the Book of the Watchers indicates to the reader that the need for judgment exists in the present in a way unprecedented since the days of Noah. As if it were not clear enough in the main text, the introduction makes explicit that the revelation of Enoch’s heavenly tour is not for the generation of the flood, but a distant generation (Book of the Watchers 1:2). The same implication applies to 1 Enoch 80, found within the Astronomical Book.

What we have found implicit in the Book of the Watchers becomes explicit in the historical apocalypses of the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse. The Apocalypse of Weeks says nothing bad about the first, third, fourth or fifth weeks. A prototype of the final intervention is found in the second week, “in it will be the first end” (Apocalypse of Weeks 93:4). In brief but certain terms, deceit and violence “spring up,” as opposed to a culmination of sin beginning with Adam and Cain in the first week. The sixth and seventh weeks represent the fuller and later downward spiral. The decline begins in the sixth week with blindness and straying from wisdom, but deteriorates considerably in the seventh week with pervasive perversity. The general message, for our present purposes, is that the *status quo* is not normal. Most weeks have been righteous enough, but the present state of the world is utterly corrupt. Only once before has there been even a partial precedent for the present state of wickedness, and that ended with universal judgment and limited salvation. Those identified as the “perverse generation” are not the kinds of sinners the world has always endured, or even the culmination of a gradual process, but a unique and radical rise of evil. “Gradual” may be a relative term, since two “weeks” of history is still a long time, but the decline is not gradual over the whole span of history, and there is an exponential decline from blind to perverse.

The Animal Apocalypse describes the exponential decline of the post-exilic period at greater length. To be sure, the post-exilic period is not the only instance of injustice, but it is unique in the rate and extent of decline. Both the good and the bad of biblical history fit into the summary. The description of the period of the judges fits fairly well with the pre-exilic period in general, “sometimes their eyes were opened, and sometimes they were blinded, until another sheep arose and led them and brought them all back, and their eyes were opened” (Animal Apocalypse 89:41). The balance of justice is stable and relatively good. Only with the exile does the situation change drastically. The decline starts slowly before exponentially deteriorating. At first, the Babylonians receive the relatively mild accusation, “they began to kill and destroy many more than they had been commanded” (AA 89:65). In the Persian Period we find the problem grows to include not only the shepherds and beasts, but the sheep as well, “the eyes of the sheep were blind, and they did not see, and their shepherds likewise” (AA 89:74). In the Hellenistic period, particularly in the second century, both the shepherds and sheep reach a profound low-point. The last twelve shepherds destroy more than their predecessors (AA 90:17), evoke the lament of Enoch (AA 90:3), and one shepherd joins directly in attacking the righteous (AA 90:13). Even stronger language describes the sheep at this low-point of history, “they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded” (AA 90:7). That’s pretty darn blind.

The Animal Apocalypse differs from the other apocalypses in a number of particulars, and being longer, incorporates other instances of sin and punishment in the sweep of history. At the level of worldview, the view of history is the same. The apocalyptic scope of history puts the present moment in a superlative perspective. The message is that never has history seen more heinous injustice. History has shown,

however, the inevitability of divine intervention to punish sinners and reward the righteous. The logical conclusion is that a proportionately radical reversal of history will occur any moment now.

Furthermore, we should consider the “narrative bridge” of 1 Enoch 91, not because it is necessarily contemporary with Jubilees, but because it is in fact an excellent bridge between the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks. That is, it describes succinctly the basic worldview that holds together these two rather different apocalypses, and by extension the *Urzeit* typology of the Book of the Watchers, as they eventually came to be viewed as a coherent collection.

[GWEN] For I know that the state of violence will grow strong on the earth,  
and a great scourge will be consummated on the earth.

Indeed, all iniquity will be consummated,  
but it will be cut off from its roots,  
and its whole structure will vanish. [the flood]

And again [in the post-exilic period], iniquity will be consummated on the earth,  
and all the deeds of iniquity and violence and sin will prevail again.

And when sin and iniquity and blasphemy and violence increase in every deed,  
and perversity and sin and uncleanness increase... (1 Enoch 91:5-7)

We have yet to consider Daniel and Jubilees in this section, but continuing with the rest of the passage will preview nicely the following sections: the final woes, the judgment and the restoration.

[GWEN] ... a great scourge will come from heaven upon all these,  
and the holy Lord will come forth in wrath and with a scourge,  
to execute judgment upon the earth.

And in those days, violence will be cut off from its roots,  
as well as the roots of iniquity, together with deceit,  
and they will be destroyed from under heaven.

And all the idols of the nations will be given up,  
and the tower(s) will be burned with fire.

They will be removed from all the earth,  
and they will be thrown into the fiery judgment,  
and they will be destroyed in fierce, everlasting judgment.

And the righteous will arise from his sleep,  
and wisdom will arise and be given to them. (1 Enoch 91:7-10)

Thus we have an outline of a view of history that runs through a series of apocalypses as they came to be read together. In order to speak of an apocalyptic view of history we must also consider the apocalypses and collection of Daniel.

#### 6.1.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel

The Danielic apocalypses, like the Enochic apocalypses, vary in framework and details but revolve around a consistent view of the exponential decline of history in the post-exilic period. Perhaps the most basic difference is that the scope of history considered in the Danielic apocalypses begins with the Babylonian exile, and consequently excludes diluvian protology. The view of history is nevertheless sufficiently broad to be indisputably transcendent on the temporal axis. The decline of history pervades all the apocalypses in Daniel, even Daniel 8, which by itself does not follow through on the temporal axis to judgment and restoration. Furthermore, the collection of the twelve chapter book of Daniel casts an apocalyptic light on Daniel 2, a court tale that would not be considered an apocalypse by itself.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On the relationship of Daniel 2 to the apocalypses proper see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), 90-91.

The basic structure of the vision of Daniel 2 relates the decline of history.<sup>2</sup> One could also call the decline “exponential” in that clay is significantly less valuable than the first three materials, and all the more so in the unstable compound with iron (Daniel 2:43). In the apocalypses the decline of history is less a matter of decreasing glory and more a matter of increasing wickedness, but the core worldview is the same. In Daniel 7 the fourth beast is considerably worse than the first three, ... דְּחִילָהּ וְאֵימָתָהּ וְתַקִּיפָא יִתִּירָא ... (Daniel 7:7). The exponential decline continues as even for this beast, the tenth horn is worst of all (Daniel 7:20). Likewise in Daniel 8, Media and Persia are dangerous, but Alexander more so and Antiochus Epiphanes most of all. Daniel 9 offers yet another variation on the same theme. The entire post-exilic period is designated for suffering, and within that period the situation degrades exponentially. Contrary to Daniel’s presumption, the exilic period is the least of the problem. The return lingers seven “weeks” without construction. When construction does come it does not resolve the problem. Distressful times only magnify in the final “weeks” as cataclysm and desolations envelop all (Daniel 9:26). In Daniel 10-11 the decline of history is spread over a number of details, but the nadir of history is clear in Antiochus Epiphanes, both generally and in particular statements such as, וְעָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-עָשׂוּ אֲבוֹתָיו וְאֲבוֹת אֲבוֹתָיו (Daniel 11:24).

The decline of history is used in different ways, and one should not imagine that we have explained the central theme of Daniel by identifying a pervasive perspective of the temporal axis. It is the case, however, that all the Danielic apocalypses attest the view

---

<sup>2</sup> Even if a historical-critical case can be made for an original reading of the four materials as four kings, rather than four kingdoms, the “kingdom” version was established by the time of Jubilees. See Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 169.

of exponential decline on the temporal axis, and the twelve chapter collection connects this theme with the court tale in chapter 2. From the Danielic and Enochic apocalypses we can be sure what the transcendent view of the temporal axis typically conveyed at the time of Jubilees: the “present” of the audience is a unique crisis—close to the bottom of a catastrophic deterioration of history. Implicitly or explicitly, a broad view of history shows that the present state of injustice is not normal or tolerable from a divine perspective.

### 6.1.3. Jubilees

Jubilees manipulates the transcendent view of history in decline in a subtle but profound way. At first, Jubilees appears to be “apocalyptic” not only in literary genre, but in a part of the worldview. Indeed, Jubilees uses more of what is generic about the apocalypses than purely literary elements in that it adopts not only the transcendent view of history, but also the idea of decline. The key is to ask what Jubilees says about the decline of history. Again we find that Jubilees uses enough of what is generic about the apocalypses to evoke clearly a reader expectation, but inverts the heart of the worldview. The difference might be stated as briefly as radical versus gradual, but such a summary would not do justice to the significance of the implications. Apocalypses typically invoke the broad view of history to claim that the present period and present moment are radical departures from what is normal in the scope of history and tolerable in a view from heaven. The present moment becomes imperative precisely because the nadir of history, or the climax of evil, is recent and radical. Jubilees takes the edge off the apocalyptic view of history.



The barometer of the decline of history in Jubilees 23 is lifespan. The point of departure for the Jubilees “apocalypse” is the problem of the correlation between longevity and righteousness. As discussed in Chapter 4, Jubilees weaves together several sources even on this departure from the “rewritten” narrative of Genesis-Exodus. The point here is that Jubilees weaves together these sources specifically to establish the *gradual* nature of the decline of history. Jubilees connects the former nineteen jubilees, Abraham’s four jubilees, Moses’ two and a half jubilees, two jubilees from Isaiah 65:20, and one and a half jubilees from Psalm 90:10. Whereas the decline of history in apocalypses is typically dramatic and recent, the decline of lifespan in Jubilees is gradual and mostly long past. The descent stretches over the entire span of history from creation to the present.<sup>3</sup> The first generations saw most of the decline, whereas the decline is empirically undetectable in recent generations.<sup>4</sup> The “apocalyptic” scope of history is as broad as possible, but the present period is an organic continuation of the process of history, not a sudden deterioration demanding radical intervention. The shape of the

---

<sup>3</sup> James Scott obfuscated this point in order to make the data fit his hypothesis of three periods of history in Jubilees 23. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 106-107. In fact, the gradual decline continues after Moses both in Jubilees and in received scripture. In no source does the death of Moses mark a sudden transition in lifespan. Joshua, for example, lives to 110 years. In Jubilees the transition from Moses’ 2.5 jubilee lifespan to the “normal” 1.5 jubilees lifespan is mediated by a 2.0 jubilee lifespan (Jubilees 23:11). Scott is correct that Jubilees 23:25 should not be taken literally to mean that restoration will not happen until after a generation in which no one lives longer than a few weeks (Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 118-119.), but even a literary image cannot be ignored. Rather, it serves to establish the point that the gradual decrease in longevity continues from Adam to the great repentance. Moses is not a turning point in longevity but just another point on the gradual decline.

Furthermore, Paul notwithstanding (Romans 8:2), it does not make sense to present the giving of the law as marking a new era of even more premature death. Scott is at pains to suggest that the diminished lifespan after the giving of the law results from the Golden Calf or covenantal disobedience. The Calf is not mentioned in Jubilees, and the punishment of mortality applies to all humanity, and consequently could not result from Israel’s disobedience of its covenant. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 107 n. 72, 116.

<sup>4</sup> The following section on the final woes will deal with the issue of infant mortality in Jubilees 23:25.

curve is the opposite of the exponential decline typical of apocalypses. The present generation stands not in the freefall of a catastrophic plummet, but at a relatively flat point along a decline spread across history. In this way, Jubilees diffuses the urgency which is so essential to the apocalyptic worldview.

The effect of this is consistent with what we found in the previous chapter. There we found that the turn of history does not depend on agents besides Israel. Here it seems that the recent events of sin and chastisement were not determined by a pattern of history outside of human control. Contrary to what one might expect from an apocalypse, there is no indication of a determined time or auspicious dates for the events in Jubilees 23. The responsibility is purely human. God had predicted that Israel would sin and require chastisement before repenting, but it could have been another generation. The events were foreseen by God, but the exact timing was not predetermined.

## 6.2. The final woes

This section focuses on what is said about the turning point of history, which can typically be described well as “final woes”.<sup>5</sup> It is not the case that apocalypses always distinguish a stage of final woes apart from the decline of history and the judgment.

---

<sup>5</sup> To be clear, other scholars have used “final woes” and related terminology to refer more generally to bad things in an eschatological context. I am using the term more narrowly to identify a stage that mediates or bridges the decline of history (or the rise of sinfulness) and the judgment. For a discussion from the perspective of New Testament scholarship on various terms see Brant Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 204 (Tübingen; Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck; Baker Academic, 2005), 29. Pitre sometimes distinguishes “the Great Tribulation” in a sense narrower than “the tribulation” (page 61), but defines them together as “the common Jewish expectation of a final time of suffering and trial that will take place at the end of the age” (page 29), which often includes the exilic and post-exilic periods (page 70).

Sometimes the “final woes” are most striking not in how they are distinct from the decline of history and the judgment, but how they bridge the two. Apocalypses do focus on an eschatological turning point, and that turning point is typically catastrophic (i.e., woeful). The woes are final at least in as much as they mark the last of the woes, but they also typically bring about significant permanent destruction, though not necessarily a complete end of the world. The apocalypses often place the beginning of the final woes in the reader’s present, with the consummation of the woes in the future. Variation can be found in many details, most notably in whether a period of final woes can be separated in the narrative between the decline and the judgment. It is significant, however, that the apocalypses develop a stage that mediates or bridges the nadir of history and the restoration. The duration of time between the onset of the nadir of history and the final resolution can be long or short, but some intervening stage appears. Although restoration, vindication and reward for the righteous are inevitable, the apocalypses often convey some sense that things are going to get worse before they get better.

In some cases final woes can be clearly distinguished from the decline of history and the judgment. The final woes can differ from the previous decline of history if evil escalates from a natural to a supernatural plane, or from earthly to cosmic. Sometimes the pattern of evil culminates such that it overwhelms the persecutors as well as the persecuted. The final woes can blend with the judgment, but can often be distinguished if the righteous must suffer or endure the final woes prior to their reward (perhaps as a period of testing), or if a formal and permanent judgment comes at a distinct later stage.

The “final woes” are typically future or not yet fully realized.<sup>6</sup> There is no single coherent “final woes” motif standard to all the apocalypses. There is, however, a cluster of views of the temporal axis that imagines a catastrophic nadir of history to be followed by supernatural destruction before finally leading to restoration.

#### 6.2.1. The Enochic apocalypses

The Book of the Watchers does not explicitly distinguish an intermediate period, but one does get a clear sense that the righteous remnant is rewarded only after enduring a harsh period of violent judgment. First, a preliminary observation should be made about the “trigger” for divine intervention. The climax of evil, not repentance, triggers the divine intervention. There is no cycle of sin, punishment, repentance and restoration; rather, the righteous and the wicked are ontologically distinct all along. Similarly, the punishment has no pedagogic function to prompt repentance. Punishment is retribution, not chastisement.

Even if the desolation of the earth by the teaching of Asael (Book of the Watchers 10:8) is classified as typological of the decline of history / rise of evil, the woes that fall between the intervention of God and the vindication of the righteous can be studied as final woes. Although the first divine command at the intervention is to instruct Noah on his self-preservation, the Book of the Watchers lends itself to the idea that things get worse before they get better when God’s angels intervene. The most obvious example

---

<sup>6</sup> Of course one must be careful not to equate supernatural with unrealized. Certainly angelophanies were perceived to have occurred, and natural disasters could have been interpreted as supernatural cosmic upheaval.

would be the flood itself. Even though it is primarily a judgment of the wicked, even for the righteous it is a difficulty to endure prior to the realization of the restoration. The war of the giants can also be considered in this category in as much as violence increases before vindication comes.<sup>7</sup> Depending on whether one imagines Noah just barely escaping all this violence or comfortably secured all along (BW 10:3), the image of intermediate escalation of violence may not be so central to understanding the Book of the Watchers by itself. When grouped with other apocalypses, however, it fits a pattern of a worldview that expects violence and destruction to increase following divine intervention but prior to the vindication of the righteous.<sup>8</sup>

1 Enoch 80, found within the Astronomical Book, brings very different details but fits a pattern of a consummation of evil of cosmic proportions prior to the separation of the righteous and wicked for reward and punishment. Chapter 80 covers three degrees of cosmic degeneration. At the most mundane level, mis-harvest could be a direct consequence of improper calculation of seasons. Drought would not be a natural consequence of calendrical error, but is a natural event in itself that could easily be interpreted as the result of sin. The chapter introduces final woes in a more narrow sense by predicting the impact of sin on a third level: the sky will stand still and the moon will change course and become brighter (1 Enoch 80:2, 4). Two observations follow. First, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, the war of the giants becomes something of a middle-judgment. Although it is divine judgment in as much as God initiates the war, it is not sudden and overt divine judgment. Rather, the Book of the Watchers suggests a more natural principle that the wicked will succumb to their own violence prior to overt divine judgment. This point, by itself, can also be found in Jubilees, but the meaning changes in the re-contextualization. In the Book of the Watchers the giants are prototypes for latter-day tyrants, while in the Book of Jubilees they are simply examples of sinners punished. Jubilees 5 is historical, not eschatological. See also the Animal Apocalypse 88:2.

<sup>8</sup> See also, in the introduction, Book of the Watchers 1:7-8. Massive destruction often precedes the vindication of the righteous in the apocalypses.

particularly unnatural predictions are necessarily for the future, as such events could not have been claimed to have already occurred. Second, the deterioration of nature necessarily applies to all humans, with no escape for the righteous. This becomes explicit, “Evil will multiply against them and punishment will come upon them to destroy all” (1 Enoch 80:8). Presumably the wise will benefit from a proper understanding of this cosmic catastrophe, but they are affected nonetheless. The date and development of the chapter poses problems, but in general terms the chapter supports the pattern of the worldview. By the time of Jubilees, a worldview that expected final cosmic catastrophe in the near future came to be associated with the genre “apocalypse.”

The Apocalypse of Weeks provides only a brief glimpse of a period of hardship apart from the decline of history and the judgment. The rise of the perverse generation in the seventh week is the culmination of the decline of history. Even though it is violent and implies a struggle of sorts, the slaughter of the wicked in the eighth week gives no indication of hardship for the righteous, and so would be better characterized as a stage of judgment than a final woe. Although the Apocalypse of Weeks does not emphasize the woes at the end of the seventh week, a reader can easily get the sense that the conflict between the perverse generation and the chosen will get worse before it gets better. In the seventh week the chosen receive wisdom, which certainly provides the benefit of understanding and hope for imminent vindication, but they do not receive the sword and victory until the eighth week (which is certainly future relative to the reader’s present). Different texts provide different details of the conflict at the end of the seventh week, but in any case it is clear that the chosen must endure a period of conflict equipped with nothing but wisdom and knowledge before they will receive military victory in the eighth

week.<sup>9</sup> The eighth week may be near, but will not come until the forces of evil finish unraveling in the “present” conflict.

The Animal Apocalypse expands the historical detail of a conflict comparable to that implied, especially in the Ethiopic, at the end of the seventh week of the Apocalypse of Weeks. Before addressing the final woes, we should note a possible expansion of the proto-woes of the Book of the Watchers. In addition to the war of the giants and the flood, the Animal Apocalypse may add a meteor-like image of stones cast from heaven, if one can have any confidence in the text after reading the copious attempts at explanation and reconstruction (Animal Apocalypse 88:3).<sup>10</sup> Even if the Animal Apocalypse does not expand the images of cosmic catastrophe of the Book of the Watchers, it at least “seconds” and builds on its account of the former judgment.

The perspective on the Maccabean revolt in the Animal Apocalypse is somewhat constrained by reality and the function as a sort of military propaganda.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, we can still identify a worldview that shapes the perspective. The reality is that neither the pietists (חסידים) nor Judah Maccabee enjoyed immediate decisive victory. The

---

<sup>9</sup> 4Q212 (Enoch<sup>6</sup>) fragment 1, column 4 line 14 is read by Nickelsburg, **וליהן עקרין אשי חמסא ועבד**, שְׁקֵרָא בִּהּ לְמַעְבַּד [דִּין] “and they will uproot the foundations of violence, and the structure of deceit in it, to execute [judgment].” The Ethiopic text is longer. Although one must be particularly suspect of the Ethiopic in light of the displacement of 91:11-17, the Ethiopic text does make at least as much sense. Here one finds a time of mutual destruction of bullies and blasphemers, **ወእምኔሁ : ይትገዛሙ : አሥራው : ዐመፃ : ወሓትኣን : ይጥህጉሉ : በሰይፍ : እምነ : ጽሩፋን : ይትገዛሙ : በኩሉ : መካን : ወእለ : ይሒልይዎ : ለግፍዕ : ወእለ : ይገብርዎ : ለጽርፈት : ይጥህጉሉ : በመጥበሕት** “And then the roots of iniquity will be cut off, and sinners will perish by the sword; some of the blasphemers they will be cut off in every place; and those who plan violence and those who commit blasphemy will perish by the sword.” Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 436.

<sup>10</sup> See especially Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 254-255. Also, Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 374-375. For lack of clear reason why the Animal Apocalypse would go beyond the Book of the Watchers where it otherwise follows so closely, it seems the image is dependent on the image of the watchers bound and cast into pits of sharp rocks and covered over (BW 10:5).

<sup>11</sup> See, however, Assefa, *Une propagande militaire?*

distinctive interpretation of the reality is that it is precisely in losing that the rebels guarantee their victory. By struggling for what is right but not themselves succeeding, the Maccabees provoke their angel and God to intercede on their behalf. Depending on how one interprets the doublet of the Animal Apocalypse 90:13-18,<sup>12</sup> the author may imagine that the woes are past and the pattern of military victory has begun, or that the righteous but losing resistance must continue before decisive divine intervention establishes victory. Either way, it is not the victory of Judah Maccabee that brings about divine salvation, but the unjust suffering. If anything the revolt brings a heightening of woes in 90:11. In verses 12 and 13 Judah Maccabee is not victorious, but only struggles, endures, and cries out. When the angel does intervene it does not mark the end of the conflict, but the turning point of the conflict. The struggle carries on, but the “woe” of the battles shifts from Judah Maccabee to his opponents.

We may or may not have an idea that it will get worse before it gets better. Although foreign angels do participate in the attack on Judah Maccabee (90:13), and God does strike the earth with a staff of wrath (90:18), we do not quite have an image of the righteous enduring a cosmic catastrophe. We do, however, have a theology of final woes. The outrageous suffering that the righteous endure in their struggle is not merely a feature of the decline of history before restoration takes place. Rather, endurance of the woes brings about divine vindication and restoration. The Animal Apocalypse supports Judah

---

<sup>12</sup> Scholars differ on whether the doublet in the Animal Apocalypse 90 should be read as a literary feature produced by a single author, or as evidence of stages of composition. Personally, I prefer to read the doublet as a coherent literary device. According to my read, the point of the passage is to extrapolate from precedent to authorize bold claims for imminent victory. The doublet can be represented schematically as A B C A' B' C'. In a past battle (A) an angel helped us (B) resulting in a great victory (C). Now, in the next even bigger battle (A') an even greater theophany will occur (B') resulting in a final victory (C'). Tiller considers a “stylistic device” option but concludes otherwise. Tiller, *Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 71.



Maccabee by giving meaning to suffering, not by denying the fact that he was unable to protect the people from slaughter or claim substantial immediate victory.

Even if the Epistle of Enoch is not clearly contemporary with Jubilees, it is worth considering because it clarifies some distinctions that seem to be operative in other apocalypses. One should not impose on the various images in the Epistle of Enoch a rational sequence of events. One can, however, identify a spectrum of aspects of judgment ranging from relatively mundane consequences of wickedness, to a “collapse of iniquity”, to havoc of nature, to a “definitive theophany”<sup>13</sup> and final judgment. Along this spectrum the status of the righteous ranges from victims, to caught in the fray, to protected from punishment all around, to enjoying vindication and vengeance.<sup>14</sup>

Although there is no consistent chronology, one might find something of a sequence of aspects (rather than a mere list of synonyms) listed in the Epistle of Enoch 94:9, “you have been prepared for the day of bloodshed, and the day of darkness, and the day of great judgment.” To some extent the third aspect or “day” can be conceptually separated from the previous two. While the third belongs clearly to the following sections on judgment and restoration, the first two are better treated as “final woes,” even if the righteous are protected from the worst of them. The definitive theophany and the vindication of the righteous are inevitable, but not immediate. Each of these three days or

---

<sup>13</sup> This phrase is used by Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 425.

<sup>14</sup> Even if some of the suffering of the righteous described in the Epistle 103:9-15 belongs to the decline of history, the woes extend at least through the nadir of history. The righteous will not have to hide on the great day of judgment (EE 104:5), but they appear very much in need of protection as chaos and violence overtakes the earth (EE 96:2; 100:5). The righteous are either protected like Noah or resurrected (EE 103:4), but either way the righteous must endure until the reversal is complete. See also EE 94:11-95:1.

aspects is imminent but unfulfilled, unlike the persecution of the righteous as part of the decline of history (see especially EE 103:9-15).<sup>15</sup>

The first aspect, the day of bloodshed, seems to include a “collapse of iniquity” such that the wicked destroy not only the righteous but themselves as well. Two passages describe such a phase of chaos and war prior to the theophany. The longer of these extends from the Epistle of Enoch 99:16 to 100:6. God initiates the destruction and the angels assist (EE 99:16, 100:4), although their involvement is known only to the wise. This aspect is comparable to the war of the giants in the Book of the Watchers. “Iniquity collapses” (EE 100:6) not merely under its own weight, but with some help. The war is natural in means (sword) but exceptional in cause (divine), object (against one’s own beloved), and result (blood flowing to a horse’s breast). The final collapse of iniquity seems to be further described from a perspective related to women in the infant-abandoning chaos and bloodshed of the Epistle of Enoch 99:4-6.

The second aspect, the day of darkness, resonates with the judgment through the forces of nature described in the Epistle of Enoch 100:11-13.<sup>16</sup> The cosmic nature of the final woes was already found in 1 Enoch 80 (in the Astronomical Book) and implicit in the Book of the Watchers in that, like the flood waters already used, the cosmos contains places and storehouses of elements that can be used for judgment. In the Epistle of Enoch the elements take an active role in judgment, not only in being withheld (dew and rain) or inundating (cold, snow and frost), but in testifying. Before God has the last word, the chaos and punishment extend to the natural order. The Epistle does not develop how the

---

<sup>15</sup> Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 425.

<sup>16</sup> See also The Epistle of Enoch 101:2.

righteous get through this, but it is at least clear that unlike the wicked, they endure (EE 100:13). As the final judgment of the “definitive theophany” dawns, the earth is in confusion, the luminaries shake, and a “flood of fire” comes down (EE 102:1-3).

The bottom line in the Epistle of Enoch is that justice is absent in the present and chaos will increase before order is restored. The fundamental instruction for the righteous is, “endure.” As mentioned above, the “narrative bridge” situates the final woes in a succinct summary of the basic eschatological expectation of several Enochic apocalypses (91:7; page 352 above). The notion of final woes varies in the Enochic apocalypses, but revolves around the idea that a catastrophe like the flood is about to happen again. The basic common view of the final woes is that the righteous must endure as wickedness consummates to overtake the wicked themselves, and chaos and destruction extend throughout the cosmos before justice will be restored. Without making reference to the flood, the apocalypses in Daniel suggest a similar worldview.

#### 6.2.2. The Danielic apocalypses

The descriptions of Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel 8 and 9 extend the idea of the decline of history to an extreme that could be classified as final woes. Antiochus Epiphanes is more than just the culmination of the decline of history in that his evil wreaks havoc on everyone, not only the righteous and holy in Israel. Daniel 9:26 might suggest that even the death of Antiochus Epiphanes would not be the end of the war and desolations, וְקִצּוֹ בַשָּׁטָר וְעַד קֵץ מִלְחָמָה נִחְרָצֶת שְׁמָמוֹת, “his end will be torrential, yet desolations will be until the end of the determined war.” Daniel 12 pushes further,

however, to imagine an even worse period for the righteous to endure, after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes and *after* the beginning of the divine intervention.

וּבַעֲתָהּ הֵיאֵל יַעֲמֹד מִיִּכְאֵל הַשָּׁר הַגָּדוֹל הָעֹמֵד עַל־בְּנֵי עַמּוֹךְ וְהִיתָה עֵת צָרָה אֲשֶׁר  
לֹא־נִהְיָתָה מִקִּיּוֹת גְּזִי עַד הָעֵת הַהִיא וּבַעֲתָהּ הֵיאֵל יִמְלֹט עַמּוֹךְ כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר:

At that time Michael, the great prince who stands over your people, will stand up, and it will be a time of distress such that has not been from when nations came to be until that time. At that time your people will be delivered—all those found written in the book. (Daniel 12:1)

Strikingly, the rise of Michael does not bring deliverance immediately, but only after even more woes. Indeed, one might well think that the woes, and particularly death, are useful or even necessary for salvation. In 11:35 death serves the function of refining, purifying, and whitening (also 12:10). Even if the undead qualify for reward in 12:3, the dead are singled out for everlasting life in 12:2. It is not the case that death is strictly required. Yet, by the time we read Daniel 12:12, אֲשֶׁר־יִמְחָקָה וְיָגִיעַ לַיָּמִים אֶלְף שָׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת, שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמֵשָׁה, “happy is the one who endures and comes to 1335 days,” it is clear that enduring against death is less important than enduring against apostasy. Despite significant differences, the woes in the last apocalypse of Daniel resemble the Animal Apocalypse in the assignment of a salvific function to the final woes. Daniel also joins the other apocalypses in the general view that evil will increase to the extremity of the imagination before the final reversal of woe.

### 6.2.3. Jubilees

Jubilees 23 adopts the generic features of the final woes in the other apocalypses, but subverts their typical meaning. Jubilees 23 evokes images of natural catastrophe, civil war and invasion that precede an eschatological restoration. It places these predictions in

an ancient setting, and uses language features typical of historical apocalypses such as, “in those days,” “then it will be said,” and so forth.<sup>17</sup> Arguably, Jubilees 23 develops more aspects of the final woes than any single previous apocalypse. Inarguably, Jubilees 23 evokes a reader expectation of a worldview comparable to that of other apocalypses on the issue of final woes. The message about those final woes is dissonant with such an expectation. In Jubilees 23 the final woes are not that final and not that woeful. Jubilees 23 undermines the typical meaning of the final woes through two basic means. First, the “woes” are punishments directly ordained by God and justly imposed on sinners according to the terms of the covenant in order to prompt repentance. Consistent with what was said in Chapter 4 on the view of revelation, Jubilees draws its “prediction” of the final woes not from new revelation but by reading the covenant curses as predictions rather than conditional threats. Second, the “woes” have already been fulfilled by the reader’s present. Even compared to the covenant curses, but especially compared to the apocalypses, the woes of Jubilees 23 are toned down. Rather than stretching the imagination with extreme catastrophe, Jubilees 23 reduces the curses to events that have already happened in the course of history. As we shall see, the fulfillment of the covenant curses, which can be taken as prerequisites for the restoration, allows Jubilees to argue that the restoration period has already begun. Both of these points require further elaboration.

---

<sup>17</sup> It also gives the “final woes” in a rather long list in Jubilees 23:13, which may resonate with a tendency among the apocalypses. See Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 414-452.

6.2.3.1. The “final woes” are just chastisement from God as prescribed by the covenant.

Jubilees 23 follows a familiar pattern of human sin and divine punishment following the terms and punishments of the covenant, particularly in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28. The sin is human sin within Israel, not a cosmic or even international evil force. The sin which “that evil generation” commits, including injustice and impurity, all comes down to covenantal infidelity.

**ወበእንተ ፡ ጎዲጎቶሙ ፡ ሥርዓተ ፡ ዘተካየደ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ማእከሎ ፡  
ወማእከሎ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይዕቀቡ ፡ ወይግበሩ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ጎእዛዞ ፡ ወሥርዓቶ ፡ ወኩሎ ፡  
ሕጎ ፡ ወአልቦ ፡ ተግኅሦ ፡ ፀጋመ ፡ ወየማነ**

[JCVK] ... because of their abandoning the covenant which the Lord made between them and himself so that they should observe and perform all his commands, ordinances, and all his laws without deviating to the left or right. (Jubilees 23:16)

The reduction of lifespan to one and a half jubilees can be attributed to the general wickedness of all humankind, but all the other woes appear in this covenantal framework of Jewish sin and just divine punishment. In other apocalypses Jewish covenantal infidelity might appear as at most a subordinate factor (e.g., Animal Apocalypse 89:60). In other apocalypses, the wicked afflict the chosen and God destroys the wicked, and the chosen may have to endure while God destroys the wicked. The other apocalypses do not, however, explain the final woes as God chastising God’s people.

The pattern of inversion applies to divine punishment as well. In Enochic apocalypses the war of the giants is a form of divine punishment, but the civil war in Jubilees 23 is part of the sin against God. God does not “send a sword” or in any way commission the civil war in Jubilees 23:16-21. Some may claim to kill on God’s behalf, “but neither truly nor rightly” (Jubilees 23:21). God’s negative evaluation of the Jewish civil war is made clear by God’s punishment of it, first in famine (Jubilees 23:18) and

then in foreign invasion (Jubilees 23:22-24). Although Jubilees 23 does not say that God sent the famine, it is implicit not only in that God controls nature but also from the pattern in received scripture that God punishes sin with famine and diminishment of natural bounty. Nothing is left implicit with respect to the second phase of divine punishment, “there will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation” **ወይከውን ፡ መቅሠፍት ፡ ዐቢይ ፡ ዲበ ፡ ግብረ ፡ ይኣቲ ፡ ትውልድ ፡ እምነበ ፡ እግዚአብሔር** (Jubilees 23:22). In Chapter 5 we saw how Jubilees 23 centers on the agency of Israel and God, eliminating or reducing to pawns cosmic evil and the nations. Here we examine the same material from a perspective of the placement of suffering in an eschatological framework. The turning point of history comes about not as a divine intervention to reverse the climax of evil. The turning point comes about as a result of repentance. The preceding woes are explicable as sin and just punishment. In several apocalypses enduring unjust suffering has the positive result of calling God to action. In Jubilees the suffering is just and has the positive result of calling Israel to repentance. Furthermore, the woes of famine and invasion are not a crisis of justice to be rectified, but the enforcement of covenantal justice.

The connection to the covenantal curses is apparent not only in the explicit framework of “they will abandon the covenant... God will punish...,” but also in the details of the punishment. Jubilees is not a line-for-line retelling of Deuteronomy 28 or Leviticus 26, but almost every detail in Jubilees 23 has a parallel in these chapters. An examination of these parallels establishes the present point that Jubilees 23 re-contextualizes the final woes as covenantal chastisement. The parallels also bring us to the next point, that the final woes are toned down to fit the claim that the covenantal prediction has already been fulfilled and the restoration begun.

6.2.3.2. The “final woes” have already been fulfilled.

For convenience sake one can organize the woes in Jubilees 23 under the categories of sickness, famine, and invasion. The first category is anticipated in Jubilees 23:12 but detailed in Jubilees 23:13,

**መቅሠፍት ፡ ዲበ ፡ መቅሠፍት ፡ ወጽልዓን ፡ ዲበ ፡ ጽልዓን ፡ ወምንዳቤ ፡ ዲበ ፡  
ምንዳቤ ፡ ወስምዓተ ፡ እኩይ ፡ ዲበ ፡ ስምዓተ ፡ እኩይ ፡ ወደዊ ፡ ዲበ ፡ ደዊ ፡  
ወኩሉ ፡ ኩነኔ ፡ እኩይ ፡ ዘከማሁ ፡ ዝንቱ ፡ ምስለ ፡ ዝንቱ ፡ ደዊ ፡ ወገበጥባጥ**

[JCVK] blow upon blow, wound upon wound, distress upon distress, bad news upon bad news, disease upon disease, and every (kind of) bad punishment like this, one with the other: disease and stomach pains;  
(Jubilees 23:13)

The continuation of the list will be considered in the second category. For the sake of brevity we will focus on Deuteronomy 28, although the same points can generally be made from Leviticus 26. Deuteronomy 28:21-22, 27-28, 35, 59-61 list comparable illness. Since we are not concerned with the finer points of language, the NRSV translation will suffice.

The LORD will make the pestilence cling to you until it has consumed you off the land that you are entering to possess. The LORD will afflict you with consumption, fever, inflammation, with fiery heat and drought, and with blight and mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish.  
(Deuteronomy 28:21-22)

The LORD will afflict you with the boils of Egypt, with ulcers, scurvy, and itch, of which you cannot be healed. The LORD will afflict you with madness, blindness, and confusion of mind. (Deuteronomy 28:27-28)

The LORD will strike you on the knees and on the legs with grievous boils of which you cannot be healed, from the sole of your foot to the crown of your head. (Deuteronomy 28:35)

Then the LORD will overwhelm both you and your offspring with severe and lasting afflictions and grievous and lasting maladies. He will bring back upon you all the diseases of Egypt, of which you were in dread, and they shall cling to you. Every other malady and affliction, even though not



recorded in the book of this law, the LORD will inflict on you until you are destroyed. (Deuteronomy 28:59-61)

The apocalypses do not include ordinary sickness among the final woes; indeed “ordinary” is a key difference between the woes in Jubilees and those in the apocalypses. Knowing how closely Jubilees depends on received scripture, it is not surprising that Jubilees draws from the contents of the covenant curses to provide the final woes of the genre “apocalypse.” It is striking, however, that Jubilees recasts the covenant curses in such a way that they could easily be said to have been fulfilled already. An interpreter might imagine that the threats of Deuteronomy 28 are not conditional but predictions to be fulfilled before an end to all suffering can come about. While one might wonder if the extremes of Deuteronomy 28 had yet been fulfilled, the disease curses as retold in Jubilees have clearly already been fulfilled.

The second category follows the same pattern of framing the covenant curses in such a way that they have already been fulfilled. Jubilees 23 lists woes related to famine and forces of nature first in the continuation of 23:13, and then in 23:18 following the Jewish civil war.

... ወአስሐትያ : ወበረድ : ወሐመዳ : ወነበርጸው : ወሰከሕካሕ : ወሰዖዛዝ : ወዐባር ...

[JCVK] ... snow, hail, frost, fever [or: heat], cold [Ethiopic ambiguous, Latin has *frigora*, Leslau offers “chaff”<sup>18</sup>], numbness, famine... (Jubilees 23:13)

ናሁ : ምድር : ትትሐጉል : በእንተ : ኩሉ : ምግባሮሙ : ወአልቦ : ዘርክ : ወይን : ወአልቦ : ቅብክ : እስመ : ኩሉ : ካሕድ : ምግባሪሆሙ : ወኩሎሙ :

---

<sup>18</sup> One might wonder if ቦጋጽ “dust, soot” in Deuteronomy 28:24 could lie behind the rare Ethiopic word ነበርጸው for which Leslau gives “chaff.” Wolf Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English, English-Ge'ez, with an Index of the Semitic Roots* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1987).

ይቲሐጐሉ : ጎቡረ : አራዊት : ወእንስሳ : ወአዕዋፍ :: ወኩሉ : ዓግተ :  
 ባሕር : እምቅድመ : ውሉድ : ሰብእ

[JCVK] The earth will indeed be destroyed [or: diminished] because of all that they do. There will be no produce [or: seed] from the vine and no oil because what they do (constitutes) complete disobedience [literally: every disobedience is their practice]. All will be destroyed [or: diminished] together—animals, cattle, birds, and all fish of the sea—because of mankind. (Jubilees 23:18)

For this category we should examine the parallels not only with Deuteronomy 28, but also other texts in order to examine how borrowed language changes meaning in the new context. Deuteronomy 28 describes famine and afflictions of nature in 22-24, and 38-40.

[NRSV] The LORD will afflict you with consumption, fever, inflammation, with fiery heat and drought, and with blight and mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish. The sky over your head shall be bronze, and the earth under you iron. The LORD will change the rain of your land into powder (קֶבֶץ), and only dust shall come down upon you from the sky until you are destroyed. (Deuteronomy 28:22-24)

[NRSV] You shall carry much seed into the field but shall gather little in, for the locust shall consume it. You shall plant vineyards and dress them, but you shall neither drink the wine nor gather the grapes, for the worm shall eat them. You shall have olive trees throughout all your territory, but you shall not anoint yourself with the oil, for your olives shall drop off. (Deuteronomy 28:38-40)

Again, the sky of copper and earth of iron is a harsher image than that given in Jubilees, and everything in Jubilees could be easily considered fulfilled. The correspondence is even closer in the next part, abbreviated in Jubilees. This is especially true in light of VanderKam's demonstration that by a simple loss of a conjunction the present Ethiopic text could have come from an original "seed, wine and oil".<sup>19</sup> The situation gets more interesting with the destruction of land, water and sky animals in Jubilees.

---

<sup>19</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 144. This phrase also occurs in Deuteronomy 28:51, although in the context of foreign invasion rather than diminishment of natural bounty, דָּגָן תִּירוֹשׁ וַיֵּצֶהָר, "grain, wine and oil."

Although Deuteronomy 28 lists slaughter and theft of livestock by foreigners in the next category (invasion), the image in Jubilees is not theft and not limited to domesticated or even land animals. One should not think that Jubilees is simply extending the famine to fishing and hunting. On the contrary, Jubilees tends to shorten and tone down Deuteronomy 28 and Leviticus 26. Indeed, we must look elsewhere for the source of such an image. The flood is a natural place to look for an idea of destruction of all life on earth, but the immediate problem is that the flood in Genesis (and common sense) would not have killed fish. If anything, it would take an amplified sequel to the flood to destroy fish. An amplified sequel to the flood is implicit or explicit in the Enochic apocalypses, but one does not find the detail of the destruction of fish. In as much as the image fits the category of cosmic destruction it certainly evokes the parallel tendency in the apocalypses. Yet, the specific image leads us away from the apocalypses and the idea of “final woes.” What is said about this diminishment of nature as a result of human sin differs from what is sometimes said about cosmic destruction in the apocalypses. Although Zephaniah 1:3 is also comparable, the closest parallel to Jubilees 23:18 is Hosea 4:3. Even if one does not accept that the author or the audience would have made such a connection, the passage is at least illustrative of how such language could be used in a non-apocalyptic, non-final framework.

עֲלֵכֶן | תֵּאָבֵל הָאָרֶץ  
וְאִמְלֵל כָּל־יֹשֵׁב בָּהּ  
בְּחַיֵּית הַשָּׂדֶה וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם  
וּגְמֻלֵי הַיָּם יִאָּסְפוּ:

Thus the land dries up  
Everything that dwells on it languishes  
Everything among the beasts of the field and the birds of the sky  
Even the fish of the sea are withheld (Hosea 4:3)

This passage might have been understood as a condemnation of a fertility cult, such that diminishment of fertility was a fitting punishment for idolatry intended to increase fertility. At any rate, the point is that the passage describes diminished fertility, not a cataclysmic end of all life. One should be careful not to over-translate the verbs אָמַל, אָבַל, and אָסַף. The idea is of drying up, languishing, and being withheld, not destruction. It is also clearly a punishment from God for the covenantal infidelity of Israel.

Both points are also true of Jubilees. The continuation of Jubilees 23 makes clear that Jubilees 23:18 does not describe the catastrophic destruction of all life, but rather a diminishment of bounty comparable to the diminishment of lifespan. The Ethiopic verbs in this verse (from the root ማለ “to lose”) need not indicate catastrophic destruction. VanderKam’s rendering “destroyed” is possible, but so is, “deprived” or “diminished.” It stands to reason that such a polyvalence operated in the Hebrew original. Also, the lack of fertility is clearly punishment of covenantal infidelity, not an extermination of universal wickedness and contamination. After all, the world proceeds unimpeded in the next verse. On one hand, the language helps evoke comparison with the second flood or other forms of universal catastrophe in the apocalypses. On the other hand, in context and in light of the connection with received scripture (Hosea), the diminishment of fertility as a result of covenantal disobedience takes on a very different meaning. In this light, it makes sense that the diminishment of fertility does not appear in Deuteronomy 28 because it is not woeful enough.

The climactic third category of punishment is foreign invasion. In this case the woes are indeed woeful, but still no more so than the covenant curses, and they do not go beyond events already fulfilled in the 160s BCE. More importantly, the foreign invasion is not the climax of injustice and evil against God, but just punishment from God according

to the terms of the covenant. This category too is previewed in the list in Jubilees 23:13, but expanded at length in 23:22-23.

... ወሞት : ወመጥባሕት : ወዚዋዌ :: ወኩሉ : መቅሠፍት : ወሕማም ::

[JCVK] ... death, sword, captivity, and every (sort of) blow and difficulty.  
(Jubilees 23:13)

ወይከውን : መቅሠፍት : ዐቢይ : ዲበ : ግብረ : ይእቲ : ትውልድ : እምነበ :  
እግዚአብሔር : ወይሁረመ : ለመጥባሕት : ወለኩነኔ : ወለዚዋዌ :  
ወለሀይድ : ወለብልዐት :: ወያነቅህ : ላዕሌሆመ : ኃጥኣኒሆመ : ለአሕዛብ :  
እለ : አልቦመ : ላዕሌሆመ : ምሕረተ : ወሃህለ : ወለገጸ : መኑሂ :  
ኢያደልው : ኢለልሂቅ : ወኢለወሬዛ : ወኢለመኑሂ : እስመ : እኩያን :  
ውንያላን : ከመ : ይእከዩ : እምኩሉ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ : ወይገብሩ : ውስተ :  
እስራኤል : ሀከከ : ወዲበ : ያዕቆብ : አበሳ : ወይትከዐው : ደም : ብዙኅ : ዲበ :  
ምድር : ወአልቦ : ዘያስተጋብእ : ወአልቦ : ዘይቀብር ::

[JCVK] There will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation. He will deliver them to the sword, judgment, captivity, plundering, and devouring. He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old or young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. They will cause chaos in Israel and sin against Jacob. Much blood will be shed on the earth, and there will be no one who gathers up (corpses) or who buries (them).  
(Jubilees 23:22-32)

Twenty-nine verses in Deuteronomy 28 describe invasion and exile of some kind. The point is not that foreign invasion links Jubilees 23 to the covenant curses more than the apocalypses, although two details are worth noting. The main point is that the explanation of foreign invasion in Jubilees is the same as in Deuteronomy, contrary to the apocalypses. Furthermore, the curses of Deuteronomy 28 are toned down to exclude woes not already fulfilled in the 160s BCE.

Two details connect Jubilees 23 to Deuteronomy 28. We have already discussed how the slaughter in 1 Maccabees 7:17 became related to Psalm 79 for the image that

none were left to bury. Although Jubilees uses language from Psalm 79, the idea was also “predicted” in Deuteronomy,

וְהָיְתָה נִבְלָתָךְ לְמֶאֱכָל לְכָל־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבַהֲמַת הָאָרֶץ וְאִין מִחֲרִיד:

Your corpses shall be food for every bird of the air and animal of the earth, and there shall be no one to frighten them away.  
(Deuteronomy 28:26)

Additionally, the specific mention that ruthless foreign invaders would show partiality neither to the aged nor the young comes straight from Deuteronomy,

גּוֹי עֶז פָּנִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִשָּׂא פָנִים לְזָקֵן וְנָעַר לֹא יֶחֱזַן:

... a grim-faced nation showing no respect to the old or favor to the young.  
(Deuteronomy 28:50)

Despite the similarities in general idea and specific details, there is also a striking difference in that Jubilees 23 excises any curses that cannot be counted as already fulfilled, such that the restoration could have already begun. The more striking general absence is the idea of exile. The Assyrian and/or Babylonian exile is mentioned in Jubilees 1, but no such mention is made in the “recent” historical apocalypse. Since the historical persecutions of the 160s BCE did not include exile, and the author did not anticipate exile happening again prior to restoration, this curse was simply omitted. Furthermore, as bad as the worst of the woes in Jubilees 23 may be (although some of them are strikingly quotidian, such as stomach aches and death at the age of seventy or eighty), the woes in Jubilees are still toned down relative to the covenant curses. For example, Deuteronomy 28:53-57 describes the most outstanding citizens reduced to eating their children and afterbirth, and greedily refusing to share with the rest of the family. Among the threats read as predictions, this one apparently was not fulfilled in recent memory. The other apocalypses, which typically imagine the situation getting

worse before it gets better, might simply have kept this prediction (if they were to base their final woes on the covenant curses). As we shall see, for Jubilees, things have already started to get better and the beginning of the gradual restoration is already realized.

Finally we come to the main issue that sets the explanation of foreign invasion in Jubilees 23 apart from the apocalypses. Jubilees 23:22-23 emphasizes three times that the punishment is from the Lord, the Lord delivers Israel to punishment, and the Lord arouses against them the sinners of the nations. Deuteronomy 28 also inserts frequent reminders that the curses are actively imposed by God as just punishment. For example, *וְעַבַּדְתָּ אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחְנוּ יְהוָה בְּךָ* (Deuteronomy 28:48), and *יֵשָׂא יְהוָה עָלֶיךָ גּוֹי* (28:49). The typical apocalypses, however, do not really entertain the idea that persecution of the chosen by outsiders occurs at the will of God.<sup>20</sup> Foreign armies represent external forces of evil acting unjustly. At most God waits to restore justice while the wicked pile up enough sin to warrant their absolute destruction. In the typical apocalypses the climax of evil is anything but a just act of God in a covenantal framework intended to prompt repentance.

---

<sup>20</sup> The Animal Apocalypse attributes such action by God to the destruction of the northern kingdom, which only enhances the contrast with the very different description of the “present” destruction (Animal Apocalypse 89:55). The Animal Apocalypse also includes some possibility that part of the beginning of the decline of history started according to God’s command, but the situation quickly degrades beyond any punishment conceivably willed by God (Animal Apocalypse 89:65).

As discussed in Chapter 5, Daniel 9:11 represents a view external to the apocalypse. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 108-109. Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 360. Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt* 238-240.

### 6.2.3.3. The white children

Thus far Jubilees has frequently evoked formal elements of the genre “apocalypse,” but consistently adapted them to convey a very different view of the temporal axis. Any such manipulation of reader expectations can be called irony in a general sense, but irony is not necessarily mischievous or intended to ridicule. In some examples, one might think the irony is simply the by-product of reframing a Deuteronomistic view of suffering in the framework of the apocalypses. (Although even at that one would have to evaluate the significance of such a decision.) The borrowing and adapting of literary features to tell a different point of view could be explained in a number of ways. As we come to Jubilees 23:24-25 we find some of the stronger evidence in favor of a mischievous use of irony.<sup>21</sup>

Already in Chapter 3, as we considered the historical context of Jubilees, we noted some parallels between Jubilees 23:24 and other apocalypses.

**በወ-እቱ ፡ መዋዕል ፡ ይጸርኑ ፡ ወይደውዑ ፡ ወይደልዩ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይድኅኑ ፡  
እምእደ ፡ ኃጥኣን ፡ አሕዛብ ፡ ወአልቦ ፡ ዘይድኅን**

[JCVK] At that time they will cry out and call and pray to be rescued from the power of the sinful nations, but there will be no one who rescues (them). (Jubilees 23:24)

First, one might compare this passage to the Animal Apocalypse. In both apocalypses we find “crying out” at an eschatological climax. In the Animal Apocalypse the lambs and the rams cry out first to the sheep but ultimately for divine assistance, such that the angel and God intervene to support the rams in battle (Animal Apocalypse 89:6, 10, 11, 13).

---

<sup>21</sup> Literary critics distinguish Horatian and Juvenalian satire on the basis of whether it is poking fun in a friendly way, or it is a bitter attack. An openness to comparable possibilities should be brought to the consideration of Jubilees 23:24-25.



Although the initial cry of the lambs to the deaf sheep is ineffective, the subsequent cries are successful first in rousing an army, and second in enlisting the angel and God directly to provide military support. The image of crying out suggests that the Maccabees raise a just complaint that is heeded by the non-wild sheep and by God. Jubilees 23:24 could be understood to reject the possibility that the prayer of the Maccabees was or would be heeded by God. As discussed in Chapter 3, Jubilees counts the Maccabees among the self-righteous sinful Jews who kill other Jews. Since the punishment comes from God as a result of Jews killing other Jews, praying to God with a sword in hand will not cause God to rescue anyone.

Jubilees 23:24 possibly echoes another apocalypse, Daniel 11:34.

(Daniel 11:34) וְבִהְיוֹתָם יְעֲזָרוּ עִזָּר מְעַט וְנִלְוּ עֲלֵיהֶם רַבִּים בְּחִלְקֵלְקוֹת:

Here we find a more skeptical assessment of human forces creating an efficacious alliance. Skeptical as the *maskilim* may be of the masses, however, we have already seen Jubilees' skepticism that *any* militants are on the right track. Militants are not a little help, but *no* help. Indeed, they are the problem addressed in Jubilees 23:16-21. Interestingly enough, the next verse in Daniel brings us to the next verse in Jubilees 23.

Much has been said in attempts to explain the white children in Jubilees 23:25.<sup>22</sup> Certainly Isaiah 65:20 is relevant to the pattern of longevity already discussed as part of the decline of history, but does not account for the image of white headed children. We already have copious reason to be critical of any assumptions that an image in Jubilees means what it means in other apocalypses. The path to understanding this verse is to ask

---

<sup>22</sup> A very different attempt at explanation was offered by André Caquot, "Les enfants aux cheveux blancs: réflexions sur un motif," in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), 161-172.

three questions: (1) What is typically said of white children in apocalypses? (2) What is typically said of white children in received scripture? (3) What is said of white children in Jubilees?

The apocalypses and related traditions consistently present the images of whiteness and/or children positively. Regardless of one's best guess as to the existence of a Book of Noah, or the date of 1 Enoch 106:2 and the Genesis Apocryphon, one can be confident that a positive image of a snow-white birth of Noah existed by the time of Jubilees. Even if such a traditional image was not expressed exclusively in the genre "apocalypse," it is easy to link the image to the apocalyptic worldview. The components "white" and "child" also appear somewhat distinctively in the apocalypses. Thus, in Daniel 11:35 the wise are "whitened" by the final woes and death. In the Animal Apocalypse white represents goodness and holiness, and the rams become white in the restoration (Animal Apocalypse 90:32). Although I remain unconvinced that הבנים was a technical term for a particular group, there certainly are examples that allude to a group or class in such a way.<sup>23</sup> The white children in Jubilees may not be a direct reference to any one apocalypse in particular, but that is not the issue. The issue is that based on what one typically finds in apocalypses by the time of Jubilees, one would expect white children to be a good thing, and probably associated with the circles responsible for composition.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> See Kister, "לתולדות כת האיסיים," 8-9.

<sup>24</sup> One might also consider a later text, the Parables of Enoch. A white head is certainly a good thing in reference to the "head of days" (God, cf. ancient of days in Daniel 7:9, 13), whose "head was like white wool" (Parables of Enoch 46:1).

There may be a tendency for the modern reader to assume that the positive valuation of “white children” is universal, rather than particular to the apocalypses. In fact, whiteness is not typically equated with holiness in non-apocalypses, even if there are some examples (Psalm 51:9). In Leviticus a child with a white head is something that should be brought to the priest to be declared unclean and cast out of the camp (Leviticus 13:3). Miriam turning white is practically viewed as a “final woe” by Moses and Aaron in Numbers 12:12 (see also Exodus 4:6). Thus a white child is not a necessarily a good thing in received scripture.

Finally we come to the big question: What is said about these white children in Jubilees? Simply put, they *are* the final woe. They are the bottom of the decline of history (measured according to lifespan) and the last item mentioned before the restoration. The curses of old age and sickness climax in a hyperbolic, one might say ridiculous, image of an infant like an old man (something like a gnome, perhaps).



Figure 6.1: A gnome

ወይጸዐዱ ፡ አርእስተ ፡ ደቂቅ ፡ በሲበት ፡ ወያህተርኢ ፡ ሕፃን ፡ ወልደ ፡  
ሠለስቱ ፡ ሱባዔ ፡ ልሂቀ ፡ ከመ ፡ ዘምእት ፡ ዓመቱ ፡ ወይትሐጐል ፡ ቁመቶመ ፡  
በምንዳቤ ፡ ወበጸዕር ፡፡

[JCVK] The children's heads will turn white with gray hair. A child who is three weeks of age will look old like one whose years are 100, and their condition will be destroyed through distress and pain. (Jubilees 23:25)

To be sure, Jubilees maintains subtlety, but once one entertains the possibility of ironic treatment of apocalyptic generic elements, and once one asks the right questions, the Jubilees apocalypse sounds considerably less apocalyptic. One need not conclude that the main concern in this verse is to ridicule an opposing group or class. The main concern is to fill out a broad view of history measured according to lifespan. As was already discussed in the section on the decline of history (and appendix 6.6.1), Genesis, along with Psalm 90 and Isaiah 65, fuel the idea that history, as measured by lifespan, has decreased gradually to a nadir of infant mortality, and then began to increase again. Jubilees draws from Isaiah 65:20 for the idea an infant of a few days but already old and not fulfilling its days, עֹלַ יָמִים וְזָקֵן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֵא אֶת־יָמָיו.

The main point is that Jubilees adopts the temporal scope and the eschatological nexus of the genre “apocalypse,” and uses the genre to convey scriptural ideas about lifespan within its own worldview that the worst is over and the restoration has already begun. This main point does not rule out, however, the possibility that the primary audience could have perceived a serendipitous disparaging reference to some distinctive imagery associated with the self-identification of some who hold the apocalyptic worldview. In light of the general pattern that Jubilees evokes but inverts reader expectations of the genre “apocalypse,” we might also understand Jubilees 23:25 as an ironic evocation of apocalyptic imagery. Jubilees uses an image that evokes the tendency of apocalypses to generate hyperbolic images, and the positive valuation on “whiteness” and “children.” Significantly, however, Jubilees inverts the valuation of the image.

As we are about to see, it is no accident that the final woes in Jubilees are all either quotidian (stomach aches, mortality at seventy or eighty years) or realized in the reader's recent history (famine, invasion). The climax of the final woes (or the fulfillment of the "predictions" of covenantal curses) is a prerequisite for the restoration. We now turn to the significance of a fact that has long been at least partially recognized—the eschatology of Jubilees is realized. The next verse describes the only condition for the turning point, a condition that is surely met in the mind of the author of Jubilees,

**ወበወ-አቶን : መዋዕል : ይእኅዙ : ደቂቅ : ይት-ኀሠሡ : ሕገገ : ወለጋሂሠ :  
ትእዛዝ : ወለተመይጦ : ውስተ : ፍኖተ : ጽድቅ ::**

[JCVK] In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way. (Jubilees 23:26)

From the perspective of the author, the final woes are already fulfilled, the proper "seeking out" of the law has begun, and the gradual restoration is underway. Charles and others recognized this much, but imagined a "temporary kingdom" prior to a still future cosmic judgment in order to reconcile the realized eschatology of Jubilees 23 with their own expectation of a unique final judgment in an apocalypse.<sup>25</sup> As we shall see, the end of the woes and the beginning of the gradual restoration in Jubilees is not temporary. Jubilees does not eliminate the idea of judgment, but diverges from the typical apocalypses by divorcing judgment from eschatology.

---

<sup>25</sup> Charles, *Jubilees*, lxxxvii, 9-10, 150. Charles' comment on Jubilees 23:30 in particular will be of interest in the following section. See also Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 168-169. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 41. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 61. Russell, *Method & Message*, 269, 292.

### 6.3. The judgment

The previous chapter considered some distinctive issues of the agents and objects of judgment. This chapter turns to the issue of when judgment occurs on the temporal axis. The issue of judgment in some form is common in Judaism. Jubilees evokes the apocalypses in particular not only with the generic framework of revelation and a transcendent scope of the spatial and temporal axes, but also in generic language including “great day of judgment.” A subject of disagreement was whether judgment was deferred to a future consummation in which the entire cosmos would be judged at once, or if judgment occurred incrementally on a rolling basis for individual persons and nations. This issue has already been observed with respect to Sirach and parts of 1 Enoch.<sup>26</sup> The Enochic and Danielic apocalypses defer judgment to a unique (or second since the flood) future consummation and universal judgment. Jubilees uses generic features to evoke a similar reader expectation, but in fact divorces the idea of judgment from the eschatological nexus. Jubilees presents a pattern of rolling judgment spread out along the temporal axis, past and future. When we ask what is said about the “great day of judgment” we find that each nation faces its own great day of judgment (or more than one), but there is no one day of universal judgment. Some nations, such as Sodom and Gomorrah, have already been judged, while others will yet be judged, unrelated to the restoration of Israel. Jubilees 23 teases a suggestion of a “great day of judgment,” but goes on to describe an eschatological sequence devoid of judgment scenes.

---

<sup>26</sup> Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 247.

In the following sub-sections we will discuss the other apocalypses only briefly for the simple point that they view a single cosmic judgment as integral to the turning point on the temporal axis. When we turn to Jubilees we will address first what is said (and not said) in chapter 23, and then the rest of the book. If one examined only chapter 23 one might think that Jubilees rejects judgment apart from chastisement for sin to prompt repentance. In fact, various nations do suffer a “final” judgment, but the distinctive issue remains that judgment of individual nations is ongoing throughout history. Only with great effort have scholars forced the individual descriptions of judgment into the eschatological scheme of Jubilees 23.

#### 6.3.1. The Enochic apocalypses

Scholars may not agree *why* the idea developed in Judaism that empires will yet be judged by God well after their decline from power.<sup>27</sup> Regardless of the explanation, the present concern is simply that the apocalypses at the time of Jubilees typically convey the idea that a cosmic judgment remains in the future apart from political decline or even death. We can sample a few statements to this effect without exhausting the interesting data relevant to a study focused on the intricacies of ideas of judgment.

The Book of the Watchers states particularly explicitly the idea of deferred universal judgment,

---

<sup>27</sup> Perhaps a sense persisted that Babylon, for example, deserved worse punishment than simply being replaced by a new super-power. Perhaps there was a sense that the evil behind Babylon persisted and simply put on new clothes in other empires. On a different level, perhaps there was an interpretive problem when curses in authoritative texts appeared not to have been fulfilled in history. Perhaps sometimes history had nothing to do with it, but the idea of deferred stages resolved textual contradictions. The canonical apocalypses in Daniel have been studied more, but the same issue applies to other apocalypses.

[GWEN] Thus they will make desolate until the day of the consummation of the great judgment, when the great age will be consummated. It will be consummated all at once. (Book of the Watchers 16:1)

Other passages support the singularity of *the* day of judgment.<sup>28</sup> To be precise, one might speak of two universal judgments, the flood and the final judgment typified by the flood. Even such a typology does not prevent us from speaking of an exceptional cosmic judgment deferred until the (near) future and linked to an eschatological turning point. Although we are focusing on the temporal locus of judgment, it is also relevant that punishment is basically supernatural in the Book of the Watchers, and basically natural in Jubilees (and Sirach).<sup>29</sup> An exceptional, deferred, eschatological judgment is not a superficial feature of the Book of the Watchers, but the core of the worldview expressed.

Skipping over some distinct nuances, such as the stages and agents of judgment, the Apocalypse of Weeks and Animal Apocalypse revolve around the same basic premise that judgment is deferred until a final batch process that will judge the sinners of all ages at once. In the Apocalypse of Weeks one finds more an era than a day of judgment. Judgment occurs first in earthly military terms, and culminates with the final judgment of all cosmic beings. Even where textual problems plague more detailed considerations, the eschatological focus on judgment pervades all variants.<sup>30</sup> The Animal Apocalypse

---

<sup>28</sup> The “hollow places” described in 22:1-14 are separated according to something of a preliminary judgment, but are primarily holding chambers until the deferred day of judgment, “until the day (on) which they will be judged, and until the time of the day of the end of the great judgment that will be exacted from them” (Book of the Watchers 22:4).

Even if one questions the date of the superscription itself, it succinctly summarizes the concern for the singular eschatological axis, “the day of tribulation” (BW 1:1). It is striking, however, that the enemies are simply “removed” as they are in Jubilees. In the rest of the Book of the Watchers worse things than removal occur.

<sup>29</sup> Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*, 230, 242.

<sup>30</sup> For example all readings of the Apocalypse of Weeks 91:15 build around the basic idea found in 4QEn<sup>g</sup>, דין עלמא וקין דינא רבא. See Nickelsburg, *Commentary on I Enoch*, 437.



provides a clear example of a period in which judgment is deferred (Animal Apocalypse 89:77), followed by a single formal batch judgment of all the cosmic and human (sheep) sinners (AA 90:20-27). Incidents of judgment are not excluded from previous history (e.g. AA 89:54-58, the northern kingdom), but the scale of the final judgment is unique. The idea of an exceptional deferred judgment pervades the narrative bridge and the Epistle of Enoch as well.<sup>31</sup> Without denying the significance of internal variations, the Enochic apocalypses cluster tightly around the basic worldview of judgment deferred until an exceptional or unique near future consummation in which all will be judged. This judgment is fundamentally linked on the temporal axis to the eschatological turning point.

### 6.3.2. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel

The apocalypses of Daniel, plus Daniel 2, share variations on the basic idea that reward and punishment does not occur in this life or throughout history, but is deferred until a future time. Again, we include the court-tale in Daniel 2 because the redaction of the book of Daniel reframes the chapter in the context of the apocalypses. One striking feature of Daniel 2 is that the image of a single statue is an awkward expression for a succession of kingdoms, especially since the sequence works down, rather than up.<sup>32</sup> The important issue for us is that the first kingdoms, even if they are supplanted in a political

---

<sup>31</sup> 1 Enoch 91:7-9; Epistle of Enoch 92:4-5; 94:9; 96:8; 98:8; 100:4; 102:1-3. Even if some degree of individual retribution is immediate after death (Epistle 103:8), individual judgment is deferred until death and earthly judgment is deferred until a future date.

<sup>32</sup> The image would seem to require that the foundation existed in some sense even before the head (unless statues are constructed from the top down).

sense, are not judged until the end when all kingdoms are destroyed together. The awkwardness can only be partially explained by the pre-existence of such a tradition.<sup>33</sup> No author was constrained to express this idea in this image, and we have independent confirmation of the belief that the consummation of judgment occurs all at once. The other Danielic apocalypses confirm the idea that political decline (or even death) does not fill the need for judgment. Daniel 2 offers a particularly striking image of deferred batch judgment, but the basic idea is hardly limited to this chapter.

Daniel 7 offers an interesting variation on the same basic idea. It is at least clear that the rise of a beast does not amount to judgment of the previous beast.<sup>34</sup> The interesting variation is that not only do the first three beasts survive until the great judgment scene, they seem to receive a deferment of punishment,

וּשְׂאֵר חַיּוֹתָא הָעֵדִיּוֹ שְׁלֹטְנֵהוֹן וְאַרְכָּהּ בְּחַיֵּין יְהִיבֵת לְהוֹן עַד־זְמַן וְעַד־:  
(Daniel 7:12)<sup>35</sup>

Rather than attempting to explain this as reflecting historical reality or a practical hope that a new Jewish kingdom would conquer one kingdom at a time, the verse should be understood as a way of emphasizing the wickedness and punishment of the last beast.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, the deferred or lessened punishment does not negate the basic principle that the court judged all the beasts in one sitting (Daniel 7:10).<sup>37</sup> The variation does not

---

<sup>33</sup> See Collins on this issue, particularly for the contributions of Swain and Grayson. Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 166-170.

<sup>34</sup> Collins has suggested that the devouring of much flesh refers to the Median conquest of the Babylonians, but even if this is the case the first beast continues to exist. *Ibid.*, 298, 304.

<sup>35</sup> The Old Greek is more vague on who receives the deferment, τοὺς κύκλω αὐτοῦ.

<sup>36</sup> Collins, *Daniel Commentary*, 304.

<sup>37</sup> Daniel 7:12 seems to suggest that the destruction of these beasts is imminent, while Daniel 7:27 may suggest that they are destroyed as kingdoms only in that they become subject to the everlasting kingdom.

challenge the basic pattern of decline of history, final woes, judgment and restoration, nor the idea that the judgment is a single universal judgment tied to the eschatological axis.

The remaining apocalypses lack detailed judgment scenes, but follow the basic idea that justice is deferred until an appointed time. Unlike Daniel 7, Daniel 8:7 gives the impression that one kingdom is indeed destroyed by the next, but this fits perfectly well with the idea expanded in Daniel 10-12 that the rise and fall of earthly power is separate from final justice. If it were possible to separate Daniel 8 and 9 as isolated apocalypses one might speak of a worldview that emphasizes woes and end of woes without an elaborate judgment or restoration. As it is, Daniel 8 and 9 should be understood as presuming a judgment and restoration expanded elsewhere. Daniel 9 ends with a brief promise that the desolator will be destroyed at the appointed time, **עַד-כָּלָה וְנִחַרְצָה תִּתֵּן**, **עַל-שָׁמַיִם**, “until the determined destruction is poured upon the desolator.” Daniel 10-12 spends more time on the decline of history than on the judgment, but one still finds the basic theme that God’s justice is not realized in the rise and fall of political forces, but is deferred until an appointed time. In the present time justice for kingdoms and individuals is absent or inverted. Only at a future date will a single great eschatological judgment bring justice to the living and the dead (Daniel 12:2). This brief survey is not intended to downplay the variations between the Danielic apocalypses on the issue of judgment, but to show the common core of the basic worldview that justice is deferred until a future consummation in which all will be judged. The variations between the Danielic and Enochic apocalypses are even greater, but the basic apocalyptic worldview of a deferred, universal, and eschatological judgment is consistently expressed in these apocalypses.

### 6.3.3. Jubilees

Judgment is a major issue in Jubilees as well, but Jubilees varies significantly from the apocalypses by divorcing judgment from eschatology. Each nation has its own day of judgment, and individuals receive justice within their lifetimes (or in their deaths). The turning point of history does not lead directly to any judgment of anyone, but only the removal of divine punishment. There is no one day or period in which all are judged. Some nations have already been judged (the most obvious example being Sodom and Gomorrah). Other nations will be judged by God in the future, but not in a way directly tied to the restoration of Israel. Judgment may be deferred in the traditional sense that God's mercy allows time for repentance, or the fulfillment of warrant for a certain punishment (cf. Genesis 15:16).<sup>38</sup> The grace period, however, applies to individual nations and not the cosmos. Judgment occurs as necessary throughout history. There is no time in which divine justice is suspended, nor any particular time in which it will be enacted.

We will begin by considering Jubilees 23. As was the case with demonic agency, Jubilees 23 is not merely silent on the idea of judgment, but includes an ironic inversion. Then we will consider what is said about days of judgment in other parts of Jubilees. We must reject the assumption that Jubilees has a systematic scheme of a single judgment which the reader must assemble by scavenging various comments throughout the book.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> There does not seem to be an "instant karma" position in contemporary texts. Ben Sira holds that judgment can be deferred out of divine mercy within a person's lifetime, but justice catches up no later than the moment of death.

<sup>39</sup> Testuz and Scott patch together disparate passages in Jubilees and present it as a single consistent scenario. Both scholars claim that a set of esoteric oral explanations would have accompanied the written text to decode its enigmas. Although it is plausible that a written text would have been accompanied by oral teaching, this dissertation is content to explicate the written text, and not reconstruct

I hesitate to argue that the various judgment scenes are contradictory and therefore not to be identified, since perceived contradictions are so easily abused by scholarship. A more objective clarity can be gained by focusing on the temporal dimension, asking *when* judgment takes place in each passage. In some instances it is clear that, despite language evocative of the apocalypses, the judgment has already taken place in the distant past.

#### 6.3.3.1. Jubilees 23

Jubilees 23 does not downplay the idea of judgment. Rather, it incorporates judgment (among other generic features of the apocalypses), but changes the context and sequence so as to change the meaning. Thus, Jubilees 23 evokes the reader expectation based on the apocalypses, among other means, by using the phrase, “great day of judgment.”

ወኩሉ ፡ ትውልድ ፡ ዘይትነሃእ ፡ እምይእዜ ፡ ወእስከ ፡ ዕለተ ፡ ደይን ፡ ዐባይ ፡  
ይረስኡ ፡ ፍጡነ ፡ ዘእንበለ ፡ ይፈጽሙ ፡ ክልኤ ፡ ኢዮቤልዉ ።

[JCVK] All the generations that will come into being from now until the great day of judgment will grow old quickly—before they complete two jubilees. (Jubilees 23:11)

This great day of judgment does indeed refer to the eschatological turning point in lifespan, but the subversion comes in what is said about this great day of judgment. Based on other apocalypses, one would expect this judgment to refer to the punishment of the nations, followed by the vindication of the chosen. This is not the case in Jubilees.

---

what is at best plausible. I also doubt Scott’s assertion that “Jubilees’ milieu values secret knowledge” or that Jubilees “like a cryptogram, requires specialized, insider knowledge and decoding.” Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 175. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 69 n. 119.

In a sense the original problem in Jubilees 23 is that Abraham and the elect are indistinct from other nations according to the criterion of lifespan, which is often associated with righteousness.<sup>40</sup> Theoretically (as Jubilees sees it), righteousness and covenantal fidelity should grant not only security in the land, but length of life to the degree exemplified by the first generations. Jubilees asserts that this will become the case once Israel seeks out the Law in the right way. The other side of this coin is that the other nations will not have security in the land of Israel, and will not have the blessings of health and longevity. They are “punished” only in the sense that they leave the land of Israel and continue to suffer the same 1.5 Jubilee mortality, stomach aches, pains, and violence that they had always suffered.

አሜሃ ፡ ይፌውስ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ አግብርቲሁ ፡ ወይትነሥኡ ፡ ወይሬእዩ ፡  
 ሰላም ፡ ዐቢዩ ፡ ወይሰድድ ፡ ጸላእቶ ፡ ወይሬእዩ ፡ ሳድቃን ፡ ወያክኩቱ ፡  
 ወይትፌሥሐ ፡ እስከ ፡ ለዓለም ፡ ዓለም ፡ በፍሥሐ ፡ ወይሬእዩ ፡ በፀሮሙ ፡  
 ኩሎ ፡ ኩነኔሆሙ ፡ ወኩሎ ፡ መርገሞሙ

Then the Lord will heal God’s servants. They will rise and see great peace. God will expel God’s enemies. The righteous will see (this), offer praise, and be very happy forever and ever. They will see all their punishments and curses on their enemies. (Jubilees 23:30)

The difference is the elevation of Israel, not any new or supernatural punishment of the nations. There is no explicit court or judgment scene. This is not the “great day of judgment.” We must look elsewhere for the great day of judgment in Jubilees 23.

In Jubilees 23, the divine punishment is not against nations and forces of evil, but rather is chastisement of Israel for its sins, by means of the nations (Jubilees 23:22-23). At the level of worldview, the pattern is not decline of history, final woes, judgment, restoration, but a pattern of sin, punishment, repentance, restoration. It is not just that

---

<sup>40</sup> See again appendix 6.6.1.

Jubilees 23 follows a Deuteronomistic pattern, but that it uses apocalyptic literary elements to describe it. Neither Deuteronomy nor any text prior to Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” or the phrase “great day of judgment” to refer to covenantal curses. Some references to the “day of the Lord” may be more proximate than others, but the term never refers to a Deuteronomistic chastisement to promote repentance. Conversely, no apocalypse prior to Jubilees portrays the final woes as just judgment from God to prompt the elect to repentance. Jubilees uses the language of “great day of judgment” in an eschatological framework, but inverts the meaning to refer to covenantal chastisement rather than final destruction of evil. In Jubilees 23 the great day of judgment is not the reversal of the “final” woes that Israel suffers, but the woes themselves. Judgment does not follow but precede the turning point of history, and thus is eschatological only in a very atypical sense.

Unlike the theophany judgment scenes and non-natural punishments in other apocalypses, the judgments in chapter 23 could certainly have already happened in history. As we saw in the last section, the final woes, which are really the main acts of justice in Jubilees 23, are realized. The sending home of invaders is hardly a judgment, but that too was realized. As we saw in Chapter 3, the “eschatological” sequence well through the judgment matches what we can tell of recent history from 1 Maccabees. We can certainly find the “sin” phase of the Jewish civil war, the initial woes of famine, and the second woes of invasion (Bacchides in 1 Maccabees 9). The repentance phase requires only studying and seeking the laws, which would have been understood as realized in the audience of the Book of Jubilees. The non-military expulsion of enemies occurred in the withdrawal of Bacchides in 1 Maccabees 9. The author may have merely asserted that the gentiles continue to suffer illness, violence and mortality (while the

righteous are gradually escaping such suffering, as we shall see). Thus, the eschatological judgments in Jubilees 23 differ from the typical judgments in apocalypses in that they could have been perceived as already realized.

Although Jubilees 23 has no judgment or punishment of the nations other than going home and continuing in the same “curses” of mortality, illness and violence, this is not to say that individual nations do not face non-eschatological judgment elsewhere in Jubilees. The rolling, non-eschatological nature of these judgments can be seen in those that have already occurred. The use of apocalyptic language to describe judgment that is already fulfilled, and not typological in the sense of the flood, contributes to the dissonance in reader expectations based on other apocalypses.

#### 6.3.3.2. The rest of Jubilees

Jubilees places judgment in realized natural history, as opposed to supernatural hyperbolic judgment, and views justice and judgment as an ongoing, rolling process, as opposed to one deferred batch judgment. Jubilees is not, however, soft on judgment. Every individual and nation will be judged (although Israel has special opportunities for forgiveness). Judgment can be harsh in Jubilees, but harshness alone is not distinctive of the apocalyptic worldview. The place of judgment on the temporal axis is what distinguishes the apocalyptic view of judgment. As we consider judgment in the rest of the book, two themes are consistently clear: judgment is a rolling process, and judgment is realized. We will consider judgment in the rest of Jubilees in three categories: the main judgment discourse with respect to the flood in Jubilees 5, the role of Enoch, and passages about individual nations.



**The judgment discourse in Jubilees 5.** Jubilees uses the phrase “great day of judgment” in one place outside of chapter 23. Jubilees 5:10 refers to the flood, not a date future relative to Moses or the readers of the book.<sup>41</sup> The flood is a realized example of judgment that demonstrates the ongoing principles of judgment; it is not a type for a particular future judgment.<sup>42</sup> The passage depends upon and evokes the Book of the Watchers, but diverges significantly,

ወአበዊሆሙ ሰ : ይኔጽሩ : ወእምድኅረዝ : ተአስሩ : ውስተ : መዓምቅቲሃ :  
 ለምድር : እስከ : ዕለተ : ደይን : ዐባይ : ለከዊነ : ኩነኔ : ዲበ : ኩሎሙ : እለ :  
 አማሰኑ : ፍናዊሆሙ : ወምግባሪሆሙ : ቅድመ : እግዚአብሔር ::  
 ወደምሰሰ : ኩሎ : እመካኖሙ : ወኢተርፈ : አሐዱ : እምኔሆሙ : ዘኢኩነነ :  
 በኩሎ : እከሶሙ

As for their fathers [the watchers who fathered the giants], they were watching [the obliteration of the giants], and afterwards they were bound in the depths of the earth until the great day of judgment so there would be punishment on all those who had corrupted their ways and deeds before the Lord. God obliterated all from their place so that not one of them survived that God did not judge all his wickedness. (Jubilees 5:10-11)

One immediately notices that there are no future verbs (the only imperfect is “they were watching”).<sup>43</sup> In contrast to the Book of the Watchers, which portrays the flood as a prototype of a single final great day of judgment, the flood itself was a great judgment.

---

<sup>41</sup> Segal makes a similar observation. See above, page 270, note 17.

<sup>42</sup> Segal came to a similar conclusion, “The Watchers story has been transformed into a paradigm of reward and punishment, and the presentation of God as a just, righteous judge.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 140. See also page 270 above.

<sup>43</sup> Since I am the first to argue that Jubilees thoroughly departs from the apocalyptic view of judgment, it is not surprising that previous translators have attempted to accommodate the text to the expectation of a future judgment. They have varied in their willingness to emend the text for this purpose. Charles simply emended the verbs, suggesting that the Greek translator mistook Hebrew converted perfects for ordinary perfects. Charles, *Jubilees*, 44-45. It is not the case that this error appears with any frequency in the translation of Jubilees. VanderKam noted the lack of warrant for emendation. The same tendency can be seen, however, in his decision to translate the infinitive as a future. Hence he translates, “when there will be condemnation on all” where I translate, “so there would be punishment on all.” VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 33.

The binding of the watchers was not a way of deferring their judgment to a later, final time, but it was their punishment as part of the judgment of the flood. The “great day of judgment” consists of the death of the giants, the binding of the watchers, and the drowning of all sinners. Everyone has already been judged. The continuation makes clear that the flood is viewed as an example of God’s unwavering justice, not a type for deferred cosmic upheaval, **ወክልቦ ፡ ዐመፃ ... በእንተ ፡ ኩሉ ... ይካንኖ** “there is no injustice... God will exercise judgment regarding each person” (Jubilees 5:13, 15). Although the genre and certain images cue the reader to the Book of the Watchers, the ideas of judgment are more aligned with those of Ben Sira.<sup>44</sup> God’s mercy can create a short grace period, but it is never the case that God’s justice is suspended until an appointed time.

**The role of Enoch in judgment.** Jubilees also addresses the role of Enoch within its worldview of judgment as perfectly realized without delay. Enoch serves as a witness to divine justice in the past and leaves writings to warn future generations, but Enoch does not have an eschatological function or return for any judgment scene after the flood. Enoch’s first function, to witness judgment executed through the war of the giants and the flood, is not so subversive except for the fact that the flood is a fully realized example of judgment, not a prototype for an eschatological judgment. The Animal Apocalypse also portrays Enoch as a witness to judgment,

---

<sup>44</sup> I do not mean to suggest that ben Sira and Jubilees are genetically related or that there was a faction of Judaism that included both. I do find it helpful that Randall Argall has shown that Sirach and 1 Enoch share a significant common ground and develop certain distinctive ideas. The relationship between Jubilees and the Book of the Watchers in this case strikes me as analogous. See Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach*.

[GWEN] And they said to me, ‘Stay here until you see all that happens to those elephants and camels and asses and to the stars and to the cattle and all of them.’ (Animal Apocalypse 87:4)

Enoch also “witnesses” through a vision the final judgment in 90:20-27, and in the Book of the Watchers witnesses the places of judgment reserved for the future. Based on analogy from other apocalypses, it is tempting to find Enoch in Jubilees as an immortal scribe recording all sin and returning in the final judgment to testify against the wicked.

In fact, Enoch has no ongoing function, even if one does not read Jubilees 7:39 to say that Enoch died.<sup>45</sup> Rather, Enoch’s lasting legacy is through his writings, which serve to warn subsequent generations of the generic punishments for sin on any given day of judgment.

Enoch’s witness of the judgment of the generation before the flood is discussed in Jubilees 4:24, and the testimony of his writings is described 10:17 and 4:19. Jubilees 4:24 and 10:17 are so closely parallel that they should be read together, despite the basic difference that one refers to Enoch himself and the other to his writings.

እስመ : ህየ : ተውህበ : ውእቱ :  
ለትእምርት : ወከመ : ያስምዕ :  
ላዕለ : ኩሉ : ደቂቀ : ሰብእ :  
ከመ : ይንግር :  
ኩሉ : ግብረ : ትውልድ :  
እስከ : ከመ : ዕለተ : ደይን

because he [Enoch] was assigned to that place [Eden]  
as a sign and to testify  
to all humanity  
so that he could tell  
every deed of (that) generation  
up to (its) day of judgment. (Jubilees 4:24)

እስመ : ግብሩ : ለሄኖክ : ፍጥረት : ውእቱ :  
ለስምዕ :  
ለትዝምደ : ዓለም :

---

<sup>45</sup> In Jubilees 4:23 the emphatic particle **ኖሁ** (נה) need not specify the time of activity with respect to Moses.

ከመ : ይንግር :  
 ኩነኔ<sup>46</sup> : ኩሎ : ግብረ : ለትውልድ : ትውልድ :  
 በዕለተ : ደይን ::

because Enoch's work was something created  
 as a testimony  
 for the whole time of the (human) race,  
 so that it should tell  
 to every generation the punishment for every deed<sup>47</sup>  
 on the day of judgment.<sup>48</sup> (Jubilees 10:17)

In the first instance, Enoch witnesses the deeds and judgment of the generation judged in the flood, but his testimony of these facts for subsequent generations appear only through his writings, not some eschatological return. Thus, in Jubilees 10:17, the subject has changed from Enoch to Enoch's writings. Although I translated literally, "the day of judgment," neither this nor any other passage in Jubilees requires that there be only one day of judgment. Rather, every generation is judged and punished in its own time. The only alternative would be to assume a future date at which every generation would be resurrected to face judgment, but such an idea is not to be found in Jubilees.<sup>49</sup> As we now turn to individual nations we shall see that God's justice against individuals and nations is

---

<sup>46</sup> One of the better manuscripts, manuscript 35, gives "the punishment for..." Even manuscript 25 could be understood in this sense.

<sup>47</sup> The word order has been changed since English prefers the indirect object to precede the direct object. "Every generation" are the ones told, "the punishment for every deed" is what they are told.

<sup>48</sup> I understand "on the day of judgment" as referring to when the punishment will be, not when the testimony will tell the punishment.

<sup>49</sup> It is clearly the case that the wicked do not rise for judgment. Jubilees 23:31, "the bones [of the righteous] will rest in the earth and their spirits will be very happy," is not much of an afterlife, and should be understood more in the sense of "rest in peace." Jubilees 23:30, "[God's servants] will rise (ይትነሥኩ) and see great peace" refers to the prosperity of the living, not the resurrection of the dead. Charles finds immortality of the soul but notes the absence of resurrection of the body. Charles, *Jubilees*, lxxxix. Volz notes that the only trace of the dead in the restoration is in Jubilees 23:31, where they become aware of the restoration without participating in it. Paul Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur dargestellt* (Tübingen,: Mohr, 1934), 29. Rowley finds "no hint of resurrection." Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 61.

ongoing throughout history, and not limited to one or two instances of protological and eschatological judgment.

**The judgment of individual nations.** Any number of individuals in Jubilees receive their just punishment at or before the moment of death.<sup>50</sup> The more difficult case is the judgment of the nations. Jubilees treats the judgment of each nation separately. Some nations are yet to be judged, some have already been judged, and some continue to exist but have been justly subjugated.

The clearest case of judgment fulfilled in the past, according to Jubilees, is the judgment of Sodom. This judgment is not typological for a single future judgment, but an example of God's open policy of judgment. Sodom had its day of judgment in Genesis 19:24-25, and Jubilees 16:5. More importantly, the same policy of non-deferred judgment extends to other nations,

ወከማሁ : ይገብር : እግዚአብሔር : ኩነኔ : በመካናት : በውእደ : ይገብሩ :  
በከመ : ርኩሶመ : ለሰዶም : ከመ : ኩነኔሃ : ለሰዶም ::

[JCVK] The Lord will execute judgment in the same way in the places where people commit the same sort of impure actions as Sodom—just like the judgment on Sodom. (Jubilees 16:6)

Whereas Jubilees mentions the flood only once after Noah, as a chronological reference point (Jubilees 23:9), Jubilees mentions Sodom in five different passages, three of which refer to Sodom as an example of judgment beyond the Genesis narrative (Jubilees 13; 16; 20:5-6; 22:22; 36:10).<sup>51</sup> Jubilees includes the flood as an example of judgment, but

---

<sup>50</sup> Cain, example, not only avoids capital punishment but receives something of a special protection in Genesis 4:15. In Jubilees 4:31 Cain was eventually killed “by a just punishment.” Jubilees 7:33 maintains that the earth will be purified (indicative) by the blood of the one who shed the blood (cf. Genesis 9:6; Numbers 35:33). Apparently judgment for individuals can be deferred within a lifetime, but no later than the moment of death.

<sup>51</sup> Jubilees 9:15 does not mention a particular nation, but may vaguely reference the punishment of Sodom (sword and fire) as applicable to nations that violate the ordained borders. Another resonance would

prefers the example of Sodom. The emphasis on the judgment of an individual city contrasts sharply with the deferred cosmic judgment in Daniel, and especially the flood typology of the Enochic apocalypses. Of course the idea of using Sodom as evidence of the real threat of God’s punishment is not novel to Jubilees, but it is unprecedented in apocalypses.<sup>52</sup> Sodom is a clear case of judgment that has already happened in a non-eschatological framework that could happen again at any time. The judgment of Sodom and analogous days of judgment illustrate how strong language of judgment (“day of turmoil and curse, of anger and wrath...” Jubilees 36:10) can be used to describe a harsh judgment that is not universal. It is universality and eschatology, not harshness, that distinguishes the apocalyptic view of judgment.

Even though limited to a single place, Sodom is a case of punishment by absolute destruction. Judgment is not always synonymous with complete destruction in Jubilees. For example, Egypt was judged for its sins with the plagues, but continues to exist (Jubilees 14:14). In the cases of the Moabites and the Philistines, the angel “predicts” to Moses that they will be judged, but it is difficult to say if the judgment was perceived as fulfilled prior to the second century BCE. Appendix 6.6.2 considers some of the evidence for what a second century Jew might have thought happened to the descendents of Lot and Caphtor. There is reason to believe that these ancient peoples (not place names) were

---

be Isaiah 66:16, כִּי בָאֵשׁ יִהְיֶה נִשְׁפָּט וּבְחֶרֶב אֶת־כָּל־בָּשָׂר וְרַבּוּ חֲלָלִי יְהוָה. While the Isaiah passage imagines sudden mass judgment of all flesh, no such suggestion is found in Jubilees. It is also relevant that the punishment for stealing territory (sword and fire) is the means by which Judah conquered Jerusalem in Judges 1:8. Jubilees 9 in general deals with the accusation that the Jews “stole” the land of Canaan, to which Jubilees responds that they stole it *back* from Canaan.

<sup>52</sup> In received scripture the example of Sodom is used in Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos, and Zephaniah. I do not count the Testaments of Naphtali and Benjamin, or 2 Enoch as contemporary.

considered extinct, in which case Jubilees can be partly understood as explaining the past judgment of these nations. Even if they exist in some sense, but lack the power they once had, they could still be considered already judged. Whereas we have every reason to believe that the typical apocalypses had contemporary enemies in mind when they promised imminent judgment, we should not assume that Jubilees is relating contemporary politics in cursing the descendants of Lot and Caphtor. Even if they were not considered judged to extinction by the time of Jubilees, we still should look to theological and interpretive problems to explain the harsh judgment of these nations. First, we shall consider how the curse of the Philistines arises from Genesis, not second century oppression by that particular people. Then we will consider the problem that may lie at the root of the condemnation of both Lot and Esau.

In Genesis 26:28 Isaac seems to make an oath (אָלֶּה) and a covenant (בְּרִית) with a Philistine king. Although this could be a problem for many interpreters, we have reason to believe that making covenants with surrounding peoples was an especially hot issue in the mid-second-century BCE.

ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐξῆλθον ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ υἱοὶ παράνομοι καὶ  
ἀνέπεισαν πολλοὺς λέγοντες πορευθῶμεν καὶ διαθώμεθα διαθήκην  
μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλῳ ἡμῶν

In those days certain renegades came out from Israel and misled many,  
saying, “Let us go and make a covenant with the nations around us.”  
(1 Maccabees 1:11)

VanderKam has convincingly shown the importance of this issue not just in one or two passage in Jubilees, but in the broadest explanation of the “origins and purposes” of Jubilees.<sup>53</sup> This oath and covenant of Isaac is precisely the problem that leads to the

---

<sup>53</sup> VanderKam, “Origins and Purposes of Jubilees,” 3-24. Elsewhere, VanderKam demonstrates the significance of Exodus 23:32, “You shall make no covenant with them,” for the selection of the

account in Jubilees of the effects of the oath, and ultimately the curse of the Philistines (Jubilees 24:28-30). It is not impossible that Jubilees could have used the term “Philistines” to refer to enemies in the second century BCE. The main concern, however, behind the harshness in Jubilees 24 has less to do with the Philistines *per se*, and more to do with making covenants with surrounding nations. In other apocalypses we might assume that a curse on a nation is hoped to be fulfilled in the imminent future, but in Jubilees it seems not to matter when it did or will happen. There is nothing eschatological about the judgment of the Philistines predicted in Jubilees 24:28-30, and it has nothing to do with Jubilees 23.

Although appendix 6.6.2 questions whether Moab was considered judged in the past, the descendents of Esau were certainly understood as alive at the time of the author. On one hand, one should not deny that the author of Jubilees has a contemporary people in mind in Jubilees 38:14, “The Edomites have not extricated themselves from the yoke of servitude which Jacob’s sons imposed on them until today.”<sup>54</sup> On the other hand, one should not think that Jubilees is primarily concerned with contemporary politics in its treatment of Esau and his descendents.<sup>55</sup> Genesis suffices to explain the complex treatment of the relationship between Jacob/Israel and Esau/Edom. Likewise, the status of Lot is a famous ambiguity in Jewish biblical interpretation.<sup>56</sup> Although the particular

---

scriptural setting of Jubilees. VanderKam, “Scriptural Setting,” 69. See also Daniel 9:27 for the issue of a ברית between Antiochus and the Jewish masses. Josephus also gives his own special condemnation of Jews not resolving their problems internally, but running off to foreign leaders to support their selfish plots (e.g., *Bellum* 1:31-32).

<sup>54</sup> The ensuing king list would seem to require that the Edomites have long since lost sovereignty, or at least noteworthy kings. Loss of sovereignty can be a form of judgment.

<sup>55</sup> For an approach very much centered on contemporary politics see, Mendels, *Land of Israel as a Political Concept*, 57-88.



interpretive problems with Lot and Esau are very different, there may be a broad issue that begins to account for the harsh judgment of both nations in Jubilees.

The basic issue, it seems, goes back to the categorization of humanity discussed in the chapter on the spatial axis. Israel is an absolute category for the division of humanity. There is no partial-credit for brothers or cousins of Jacob. For purposes of marriage, purity, covenant, temple, and eschatological restoration, all of non-Israel is completely excluded, regardless of what may have been temporarily acceptable in the time of the patriarchs. Jubilees is bound by the complexities of received scripture, but uses judgment to resolve all ambiguities about related peoples. The treatment of Esau is complex, but the bottom line is simple—Esau's and all his descendents will be destroyed (Jubilees 35:14; 36:10). Likewise, the family tie between Abraham and his nephew does not extend to their descendents (Jubilees 16:9). God's promises, particularly for mercy from total judgment, apply to Israel alone. Israel's historical extended family and allies have been or will be judged like every other nation, but there is nothing eschatological about their judgments.

The harsh judgment in Jubilees of Caphtor, Lot, and even Esau is not the product of contemporary oppression or political tension. Rather, their rejection resolves theological problems in authoritative texts. This alone would be a significant point of contrast with what one typically finds in the apocalypses. It also brings us back to our general point for this section. The idea of judgment is important for Jubilees, but judgment is not anchored on the temporal axis. Each nation is judged individually, but none of these judgments are tied to the reader's present or the restoration in Jubilees 23.

---

<sup>56</sup> Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 329-331.

The turning point in Jubilees 23 brings separation between Israel and the nations, but not final judgment of any or all nations. The only punishment in Jubilees 23 is the covenantal punishment of Israel leading to repentance, and the worst that happens to the other nations is that they are sent home and left out of the restoration of Israel.<sup>57</sup> There is harsh judgment in Jubilees, but harshness does not distinguish the apocalyptic worldview. Judgment is a rolling process for individual nations, rather than a single batch judgment deferred to a future time. Jubilees has the literary components of the genre, including language such as, “great day of judgment,” a turning point of history, and the theme of judgment. Jubilees sounds like other apocalypses, but assembles the pieces in such a way as to undermine the view of judgment on the temporal axis typically found in the apocalypses.

#### 6.4. The restoration

The restoration in Jubilees is distinctive on two temporal issues. First, the restoration is gradual and has already begun. Second, the restoration restores and fulfills the original plan of creation. The first issue is relatively simple and clear. From a temporal perspective, the restoration typically happens quickly and radically, such that one could not claim that it has already happened in history. In Jubilees, the restoration is gradual and has already begun, casting a very different light on the present moment. The issue is not the degree of the change, but the temporal nature of the change and time relative to the present.

---

<sup>57</sup> As discussed in the previous chapter on the spatial axis, the apocalypses often make room for other nations in the restoration.

The second issue is subtle and complex. The other apocalypses do not emphasize a clear and consistent view of the “old” creation, at least not in the narrow sense of ecological continuity (but more so in social structures). Yet, it is important to consider the issue here. The second issue allows us to step back from the particulars of Jubilees 23 and grasp the more fundamental perspective conveyed throughout the book. Jubilees maintains a fundamentally positive, even Panglossian, view of creation, received scripture, the temple, the priesthood, national identity, and social structure in general. The “new creation” in Jubilees is a restoration and making permanent of things that have already existed in biblical history. It is not a rejection of the world or the history of Israel. There is no new covenant, new temple, new social order, or new creation other than the fulfillment and making permanent of the original plan of creation. The second issue will also allow us to grapple with some of the most difficult passages in Jubilees in some related appendices. These passages will allow me to demonstrate how some previously perplexing passages come into clearer view when approached without the assumption that Jubilees is like the other apocalypses. We will consider the other apocalypses for both issues, and then consider Jubilees in two sections, first the gradual and realized restoration in Jubilees 23, and then the view of old creation in Jubilees as a whole.

#### 6.4.1. Third Isaiah

Once again, it is not the case that the worldview of Third Isaiah aligns uniformly with either the apocalyptic worldview or the worldview of Jubilees, but it is the case that Third Isaiah forms the background to the disputed issues at hand. On the first issue, Third

Isaiah clearly conveys the idea of a rapid and radical reversal in the near future, as, for example, in,

לוא־קִרְעַת שָׁמַיִם יִרְדֹּת מִפְּנֵי הָרִים נָזְלוּ  
(Isaiah 63:19—64:1<sup>58</sup>) בְּקֶדֶחַ אֵשׁ הַמָּסִים מִים תִּבְעָה־אֶשׁ

Radical reversal is not unique to Third Isaiah, but the language of new creation is distinctively clear in Third Isaiah, especially 65:17,<sup>59</sup>

כִּי־הִנְנִי בּוֹרֵא שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים וָאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה וְלֹא תִזְכְּרָנָה הָרָאשִׁנוֹת וְלֹא תִעֲלֶינָה עַל־לֵב:  
(Isaiah 65:17)

It is also evident that Jubilees has this passage (65:20) in mind when treating the issue of lifespan, as discussed above. If read literally, Isaiah 65:17-25 contributes the image of ecological discontinuity, i.e. a rewriting of the basic laws of nature and a complete replacement of earth and sky. The more persistent point in Third Isaiah is the revision of the social order, not only class but priesthood (Isaiah 61:6; 66:21) and national identity (56:8).<sup>60</sup> On the issue of the status of the old creation, it is not the case that the early apocalypses consistently dwell on the replacement of the old creation with a new creation, such that the treatment in Jubilees should be understood as a direct response to the apocalypses. Rather, Third Isaiah raises the idea of a new creation, and the apocalypses and Jubilees develop the idea in different directions. For Jubilees, the restoration is new in the sense of renewal or restoring the past. In the apocalypses, there is less about the world that is worth saving (even if the starkest imagery of total ecological replacement develops later).

---

<sup>58</sup> See also 58:8; 59:19; 61:11; 62:11; 63:4; 66:12.

<sup>59</sup> Reprised, with emphasis on everlasting, in Isaiah 66:22.

<sup>60</sup> Consider also the אָחֵר in Isaiah 65:15.

#### 6.4.2. The Enochic apocalypses

The Enochic apocalypses clearly and consistently imagine a rapid and radical restoration, a restoration that could not have been called realized.<sup>61</sup> The Enochic apocalypses are not uniform in how they imagine the continuity between the old creation and the new creation. The Book of the Watchers resembles Jubilees in imagining a restoration to Eden. Other Enochic apocalypses either suggest or state that the whole world will pass away. The issue is not merely the view of flora and fauna, but the valuation of salvation history after Eden. Jubilees and the Book of the Watchers end up back in Eden, in a sense, but Jubilees takes more with it, including the Torah, temple, priesthood, and national boundaries.

Even though the *Urzeit* typology in the Book of the Watchers is realized, the *Endzeit* fulfillment remains for the future. The Book of the Watchers speaks of both judgments at once, but makes clear that the fulfillment remains for the future in that the restoration is too radically glorious to fit the period following the flood.<sup>62</sup> As for the second issue, the Book of the Watchers is actually very similar to Jubilees in that it imagines a restoration that is like the beginning of the old creation. This is particularly so in that longevity is restored to a thousand years (but not eternity),<sup>63</sup> and in the use of

---

<sup>61</sup> Grant Macaskill emphasizes an aspect in which the eschatology of *1 Enoch* is not entirely future. He calls the eschatology inaugurated in as much as that the revelation of wisdom to a remnant group (including opening their eyes) has already occurred. One could add that the decline of history and beginning of the final woes are also typically realized. Nevertheless, the judgment and restoration are thoroughly unrealized. The reversal of history is in the imminent future, but in the future nonetheless. Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 45.

<sup>62</sup> See especially 1:4-7 and 25:3. For a recent discussion of the future judgment in the Book of the Watchers, set in the context of the past judgment, see *Ibid.*, 33-34. See above, page 396, note 42.

<sup>63</sup> Book of the Watchers 5:9 (“the number of their days they will complete”); 25:4-6 (“such as your fathers lived also in their days”)

references to Eden in the description of the restoration. The restoration is not so radical that it could not be called a restoration of precedent and the original plan of creation, other than the removal of that dangerous tree.<sup>64</sup> The question of what is *not* found in the restoration is a bit more tricky. I am skeptical of arguments from silence or later developments, and am generally inclined to think that the lack of reference to the Sinai covenant should be primarily understood in terms of the ancient setting and “audience” (i.e., the fact that the testimony of Enoch, unlike Torah of Moses, applies to all of humanity). Nevertheless, it is the case that the Book of the Watchers does nothing to rule out the possibility, for later interpreters, that the final restoration would be a world without Torah, national boundaries, hierocracy or perhaps even a temple.

The Astronomical Book develops a less detailed vision of the restoration, and one should be suspect of the antiquity (relative to Jubilees) of some parts. We should just briefly note two items that contribute to the idea of the entire earth and sky being replaced with a new earth and sky. First, the Astronomical Book 72:1, “... how every year of the world will be forever, until a new creation lasting forever is made,” could suggest that the new creation will discontinue the world and history as we know it. Second, the phrase, “for the generations of the world” (Astronomical Book 81:2; 82:1) could mean that there will be no more generations in this world after the predictions are fulfilled. To be sure, the relationship between the old and new creation is not emphasized in the Astronomical Book.

Again, the Apocalypse of Weeks is striking in that three “weeks” of history pass between the turning point and the final end of history. Be that as it may, one would not

---

<sup>64</sup> Book of the Watchers 10:16—11:2; 25:4-6

call the restoration in the Apocalypse of Weeks gradual in the sense of imperceptible or potentially realized, as we shall see in Jubilees. Even the initial reversal at the beginning of the eighth week is more radical than could have been understood to have already happened. The present of the reader is the end of the seventh week.<sup>65</sup> One effect of “spreading out” the destruction of the old is that contempt for multiple aspects of creation can be conveyed. One of the first “changes” to be made is that a temple will be built to replace the first temple (the second is not even acknowledged). The next change is that, as Nickelsburg translates, “righteous law will be revealed to all the sons of the whole earth... and all humankind will look to the path of everlasting righteousness” (Apocalypse of Weeks 91:14). One problem with concluding from this that the Law of Moses is viewed as unrighteous is that דין קשויט is probably better rendered as Nickelsburg himself twice renders it in the Apocalypse of Weeks, “righteous judgment.”<sup>66</sup> Another problem is that the Law of Moses was called “a covenant for all generations” in the Apocalypse of Weeks 93:6.

I do not mean to suggest that the Apocalypse of Weeks embraces the law of Moses without reservation. Rather, I mean to place the emphasis where the Apocalypse of Weeks does, on the extension to all humanity. The problem with the law of Moses is *not* that it is not righteous, or even that it is not eternal, but that it was revealed only to Israel, and not all humanity. Whether the righteous judgment revealed to all nations is

---

<sup>65</sup> James C. VanderKam, “Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1-10; 91:11-17),” in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup 62 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 377-379 (521-523 in the 1984 publication). Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 441.

<sup>66</sup> See the discussion in Nickelsburg, *Commentary on 1 Enoch*, 449. The phrase also appears without requiring a sense of “law” in 4Q197 (Tob<sup>b</sup>), 4Q205 (En<sup>d</sup>), 4Q213a (Levi<sup>b</sup>) (cf. 4Q246).

identical to the Mosaic Torah, similar but adapted to a new audience, or completely different, the major shift in the ninth week is that national boundaries are dissolved. To the extent to which the Apocalypse of Weeks downplays the eternal validity of the Torah of Moses, the author of Jubilees must be seething mad, but the extension of law (or revealed righteous judgment) to the other nations is no more tolerable. Last, and probably least among the issues at hand, the heaven is thrown out and replaced with a new improved heaven, seven times brighter. The need for a new cosmos says nothing good about the original cosmos; even if it was not made corrupt it has become irreparably corrupt. Although ecological discontinuity may be more radical to the modern reader, the issues of the legitimacy of the second temple and national boundaries were seven times hotter than the luminaries of the firmament.

The same basic worldview is expressed in the Animal Apocalypse. On the first issue, it is again clear that the radical restoration is unrealized. Even if angelophanies were perceived in history, the earth opening up to swallow foreign armies, and everything thereafter, was not fulfilled in the second century. As for the second issue, creation may be restored more than replaced, but it is restored to a time without nations, Torah, or arguably hierarchy. The temple is emphatically rejected and replaced. History essentially reverses and goes back to the original creation of Adam. The Animal Apocalypse states what was not stated in the Book of the Watchers. The division of humanity into nations is reversed, as all again become one “species” (Animal Apocalypse 90:38). Even more explicitly than the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Animal Apocalypse rejects the legitimacy or recoverability of the second temple, explicitly tearing down the “old house” and building a new one (Animal Apocalypse 90:28-29). The birth of the new leader may be more ambiguous, but this certainly doesn’t sound like a restoration of the



Zadokite priesthood or Davidic monarchy (AA 89:12).<sup>67</sup> Of course, other elements, such as the reversal of the diaspora, were not controversial (AA 90:33). The Animal Apocalypse does not extend its critique to the heavens or the earth by adding a replacement heaven or earth, nor does it deal with longevity or immortality. One could even say that the end goal of the restoration is simply the return to the original plan. Contrary to Jubilees, the original plan did not include the separation of Israel, the received structures of authority, or explicit importance of the revelation at Sinai.

#### 6.4.3. The Danielic apocalypses and the book of Daniel

The apocalypses in Daniel and Daniel 2 convey an expectation of a sudden radical reversal that has not yet taken place. There is nothing gradual about the sudden supernatural destruction of the world's empires and the establishment of a Jewish empire far superior to any previous empire (Daniel 2:35, 44). Scholars may continue to disagree about certain details in Daniel 7, but second century Judea saw no dominion served by all peoples. The resurrection in Daniel 12 likewise stands outside of realized history. Like the Enochic apocalypses, there is nothing subtle or gradual about the restorations conceived in Daniel. Daniel has optimism for the future, but a very negative view of the present.

The view of the former order reflected in the new order is more ambiguous and should not be inflated to a major concern. On one hand, the establishment of a global Jewish empire surpassing all previous empires is not a restoration of even the most

---

<sup>67</sup> In order to parallel the last white bull it would have to go back at least to Isaac.

glorified past. On the other hand, it is very much earthly. In Daniel 12 the highest level of reward is outside the earthly realm (at least figuratively), but this is not exactly a rejection of the value of creation. There may not be emphasis on the restoration as a Torah-centered society, but a rejection or replacement is not suggested either.<sup>68</sup> Once the abomination which desolates the temple is removed, the temple can apparently recover fully. The restoration surpasses the world as we know it, but does not particularly replace it. Daniel has a negative view of the present moment, but not salvation history as a whole. Daniel is basically neutral on this issue, and certainly does not contrast with Jubilees as sharply as the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse.

#### 6.4.4. Jubilees

Jubilees takes a very different view of the temporal nature of the restoration than the contemporary apocalypses. The restoration in Jubilees 23 is gradual, which is a difference by itself, but more importantly, this leads to the conclusion that the restoration has already begun. The genre “apocalypse” still functions to create an imperative view of the present moment, but it is a positive view of the present.

The second issue is more subtle, but no less significant. Although we have not found uniformity in the view of apocalypses on the recoverability of creation and salvation history since Eden, relative to Jubilees, the apocalypses are either silent or overtly negative on the continuity of the Jewish tradition in the restoration. The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse do not speak for all the apocalypses,

---

<sup>68</sup> See chapter four of this dissertation on the view of Jeremiah and the Torah of Moses implied in Daniel 9.

but they do speak loudly on the rejection of exclusive revelation and temple for Israel, as well as the traditional structure of priestly authority. No apocalypse besides Jubilees overtly counters this view. Thus, we can say this negative view is associated with the apocalypses even if it is not a standard part of the apocalyptic worldview.

Although it has been noted that Jubilees takes a favorable view of the temple, priesthood, Jewish particularism, and the law and covenant associated with Sinai, I will present these issues from the perspective of the eschatological restoration. In some related appendices, I will also demonstrate how my reading of Jubilees in general can make sense of some previously perplexing passages. Finally, I will suggest that we should not extrapolate periods of history (larger than a jubilee period) beyond what is said in Jubilees. Rather, I suggest, the first 2450 years of creation can be seen as preparation for eternity, and everything thereafter as eternity. Although the plan of creation is not fulfilled and stabilized as of the beginning of eternity, there is an emphasis that nothing new is needed, except to fulfill the old. The restoration stabilizes but does not change or add to the best of the period of creation through the dwelling of God in Aaron's sanctuary and entry into the land.

#### 6.4.4.1. The restoration in Jubilees 23 is gradual and has already begun.

Scholars since Charles have noted that the restoration in Jubilees is gradual,<sup>69</sup> and Russell seems to have grasped some of the significance of the fact that Jubilees stands out among apocalypses for an “evolutionary rather than cataclysmic” restoration.<sup>70</sup> Further

---

<sup>69</sup> Charles, *Jubilees*, 149. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 61.

<sup>70</sup> Russell, *Method & Message*, 268 n. 4.

significance comes from the context of the present work. This is not one way that Jubilees is different, but the climax of a pattern of differences. Not only is the restoration gradual, it has already begun. The repentance phase (itself distinctive among early apocalypses),<sup>71</sup> which has already begun in as much as that the book has any audience, leads directly to a gradual restoration. Although the end result is dramatic, there are no ahistorical conditions or predictions to be fulfilled before the blessings begin.

ወበወ-አቶን : መዋዕል : ይእኅዙ : ደቂቅ : ይትጎሠሡ : ሕገገ : ወለጋሢሠ :  
ትእዛዝ : ወለተመይጦ : ውስተ : ፍኖተ : ጽድቅ ::  
ወይእኅዛ : መዋዕል : ይብዝኑ : ወይልሀቃ : ወውሉደ : ሰብእ : ትውልድ :  
እምትውልድ : ወዕለት : እመዋዕል : እስከ : ሶበ : ይቀርብ : መዋዕሊሆሙ :  
ለዐሠርቱ : ምእት : ዓመት : ወለብዙኅ : ዓመታት : እምነ : ብዙኅ : መዋዕል

In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way.

The days will begin to become numerous and increase, and people as well—generation by generation and day by day until their lifetimes approach 1000 years and to more years than the number of days (had been). (Jubilees 23:26-27)<sup>72</sup>

Since the restoration in lifespan is gradual, it would have been impossible to falsify the claim. Indeed, since the time of composition was a time of peace following a period of civil war, famine and occupation (see Chapter 3), an increase in life expectancy would

---

<sup>71</sup> Even if one counts the lambs opening their eyes in the Animal Apocalypse as a form of repentance, it does not lead directly to restoration, but rather to final woes. In general, and perhaps also in the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks is more typical in the view that the chosen are chosen because they are already righteous (if for any reason at all), not because they repented prior to receiving esoteric revelation. Again, I do not count the prayer in Daniel 9 as an endorsed explanation of the situation in the last days.

<sup>72</sup> James Kugel demonstrates how this obscure phrase relates to Psalm 90:14-15, **שְׂבַעֲנוּ בְּבֹקֶר חֲסִידֶיךָ** : **וְנִרְנְנָה וְנִשְׂמְחָה בְּכָל־יְמֵינוּ** : **שְׂמַחֲנוּ כִּימֹת עֲנִיּוֹתֵנוּ שְׁנוֹת רָאִינוּ רָעָה** . While it would make no sense to ask to be gladdened like the days one was afflicted, Jubilees makes sense of it by asserting that in the restoration Israel would get back the days humanity had lost to punishment for wickedness, and be happy all the days they were miserable. Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” 333-334. It is difficult to translate in such a way that stays close to the Ethiopic while making clear the allusion and the meaning. The basic idea, drawing from Jubilees 4:30 (“[Adam] lacked 70 years from 1000 years because 1000 years are one day in the testimony of heaven”), is that if humanity now lives 70 years and is given back the number of years of Adam, they will reach the 1000 years that was originally intended.

have been apparent. The restoration of longevity is not immortality, but returning to the original plan for humanity in Eden. This, by itself, is not so different from the Book of the Watchers, but other differences will become apparent in the next sub-sub-section. Compared to other apocalypses, it is striking that the restoration does not go beyond what had once been the case in the ideal past. Even the climax of restoration in Jubilees 23 does not go beyond what is imagined to have already been the case in the “old” creation. The old creation may need to be restored to its former glory, but it does not need to be replaced. We see this in Jubilees 23 with respect to longevity, but more points like this will come out when we consider the rest of the book.

It would be an over-reaction to lump Jubilees with later examples of realized or inaugurated eschatology, but we should not miss the significance of the difference between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses. We should consider how the view of the present moment in Jubilees differs from what a reader would expect. Jubilees still amplifies the significance of the present moment, but it shifts from a moment of crisis to a moment of opportunity. The hope and promises are no longer mediated by threats and pessimism. Pulling in some issues from other chapters, the plan of restoration does not require new revelation, but a return to traditional social and textual authorities. The promises are not complicated by external agents or arbitrarily appointed dates; rather, the continuing restoration of history depends only on the decision of the people of Israel. The audience is called to Torah study, not warfare or martyrdom. Jubilees asserts the worst is over. The difference between Jubilees and contemporary apocalypses on the temporal relationship between the present and the restoration (i.e., whether the restoration has begun) should be more than a footnote in the study of Jewish thought and literature in antiquity.

6.4.4.2. The restoration in Jubilees as a whole restores and fulfills the original plan of creation.

Everything that is needed for the restoration in Jubilees was established at some point in the history of the world from creation through the sanctuary in the wilderness. There is nothing new except the making permanent of what once existed. Furthermore, the particulars of Jewish history (the division of nations, the exclusive covenant, the priesthood) are not part of the decline of history, but were the original plan of creation written on the heavenly tablets. God did not make the best of a bad situation with a sinful cosmos, a sinful humanity, and a sinful Israel. Rather, God's intention to form a covenant with Israel is written on the heavenly tablets and is manifested in the first week of creation. It is true that a pedagogic period of Deuteronomistic sin and punishment took place before Israel became ready to sustain its purity. Yet, as Israel turns to study the heavenly tablets, according to Jubilees, the final implementation of the plan of creation is becoming manifest.

Besides the restoration of the original lifespan, which we already considered, we will consider Jubilees' view of the fulfillment, not replacement, of four aspects of the plan of creation: (1) the people of Israel (the priests to a higher degree, but not all humanity) will be holy (pure, set apart); (2) the land of Israel (Zion to a higher degree, but not the whole world) will be holy (pure, set apart); (3) God will dwell in a sanctuary among the people of Israel; (4) the calendar of Israel will synchronize with the heavenly calendar. I do not count among these four the revelation of the heavenly tablets to Moses at Sinai. Certainly the restoration is characterized by the continuation of the Torah, but the Torah is not *part of* the plan of creation/restoration, it *is* the plan of creation/

restoration. I will begin with this overarching point, and then consider the four aspects of the plan of creation, and then propose what, if anything, one might speculate about large periods of history in Jubilees after the jubilee of jubilees.

**The revelation at Sinai is fulfilled in the restoration, not surpassed.** Scholars may differ on how the Enochic apocalypses view the status of revelation to Moses at the time of the eschatological restoration. It is not impossible to read some of these works as viewing the Sinai covenant and revelation as insufficient or temporary (something of a stopgap measure). The obvious problem is that a law for Israel at the time of Moses would not suffice to explain the judgment of other nations at any time. Scholars will continue to debate the extent to which the negative evaluation of the Torah of Moses goes beyond this.<sup>73</sup>

What is clear is that in Jubilees there is only one set of heavenly tablets, revealed throughout the jubilee of jubilees and completely to Moses, and there is only one basic covenant, renewed on occasion throughout history and made permanent (and exclusive) with Israel at Sinai. There is only one true way, and that is the way revealed to Moses. The eternality of the heavenly tablets and their complete revelation to Moses is evident throughout Jubilees, and also emphasized in eschatological contexts. Jubilees 23:26 emphasizes that the restoration comes by studying the laws. The eternal unity of revelation is borne out in that the description of the restoration echoes not only the Pentateuch (Deuteronomy 7:9, etc.), but also Isaiah (65), and Psalms (90).<sup>74</sup> Jubilees 23

---

<sup>73</sup> This issue is not entirely separable from the interpretation of בְּרִית הַדָּשָׁה in Jeremiah 31:31, most notably in the Damascus Document (CD 6.19; 8.21; 20.12). See also Peshar Habakkuk 2.3; 1QS<sup>b</sup> 3.26; 5.5, 21.

<sup>74</sup> I am not trying to make any suggestions of a canonical nature, only that the authoritative status of Isaiah and Psalms was not clearly distinguished from the law of Moses.

concludes with a reminder that this, like everything written by Moses, is “written and entered in the testimony of the heavenly tablets for the generations of eternity,” **ጽሑፍ : ውእቱ : ወየዐርጉ : ውስተ : ስምዐ : ጽላተ : ሰማይ : ለትውልድ : ዘለዓለም**.

Throughout the rest of the book, Jubilees emphasizes that the laws received by Moses will never expire. Some may doubt whether the copious language of “forever” and “eternal” used to describe the laws revealed to Moses necessarily applies to the eschatological restoration.<sup>75</sup> Often enough, even stronger language dispels any such doubt. For example, the phrase, **ወአልቦ : ለዝ : ሕግ : ዐቅመ : መዋዕል** “this law has no temporal limit” appears six times to describe the laws of blood (Jubilees 6:14), tithe (13:26),<sup>76</sup> second tithe (32:10), the festivals of Tabernacles (16:30) and Passover (49:8), and the prohibition of exogamy (30:10). One should understand this assertion to indicate that the law as a whole has no temporal limit, not only these six. Similarly strong language is used of circumcision,

**ወዝሕግ : ከኩሉ : ትውልድ : ዘለዓለም : ወአልቦ : ክስበተ : መዋዕል ::  
ወአልቦ : ተዐድዎ : አሐተ : ዕለተ : እምሰማኒ : መዋዕል : እስመ : ሥርዓት :  
ዘለዓለም : ውእቱ : ሥሩዕ : ወጽሑፍ : ውስተ : ጽላተ : ሰማይ ::**

This law is for every generation forever. There is no circumcising of days.<sup>77</sup> There is no omitting any of the eight days, for it is an eternal ordinance, ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. (Jubilees 15:25)

---

<sup>75</sup> Jubilees Prologue; 2:33; 3:14; 6:14; 13:25; 32:10; 33:16; 49:17.

<sup>76</sup> This verse also suggests that the priesthood will be eternal.

<sup>77</sup> The point is clear enough from “eternal ordinance,” but the point is even stronger if one reads with Segal, “there is no completion (מולות or מולאת) of days” rather than “there is no circumcising (מולת) of days.” Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 235. Segal’s argument is compelling, but it should probably be understood as a pun suggesting both meanings, rather than one or the other.



In one case, at least partly to deal with unpunished behavior of a patriarch, Jubilees develops the notion that the laws are eternal, but are only applicable once they are revealed (and are then applicable ever after).

እስመ : ኢተክሥተ : ሥርዓት : ወኩነኔ : ወሕግ : እስከ : አሜሃ : ፍጹመ :  
ለኩሉ :: እስመ : በመዋዕሊክ : ከመ : ሕገ : ጊዜ : በመዋዕሉ : ወሕግ :  
ዘለዓለም : ለትውልድ : ዘለዓለም : ወአልቦ : ለዝ : ሕግ : ተውዳክ : መዋዕል

For the statute, the punishment, and the law had not been completely revealed to all but (only) in your time as a law of its particular time and as an eternal law for the generations of eternity. There is no time when this law will be at an end... (Jubilees 33:16-17)

Besides supporting the present point that the laws revealed at Sinai do not expire in the restoration, this passage demonstrates that the heavenly tablets were not *completely* revealed before Sinai, even though many laws were revealed and followed (or punished) previously.<sup>78</sup> No previous revelation is as complete as that given to Moses.

**The separation of Israel for purity and holiness was planned from creation and will be fulfilled in the restoration.** The previous chapter considered the categorization of humanity from the perspective of the spatial axis; here we consider the election of Israel on the temporal axis, as both original to the plan of creation and maintained in the restoration. The idea of election was not disputed. The dispute concerned whether humanity would return in the restoration to a unified state with a single religion. The apocalypses and Third Isaiah do not necessarily convey *equality* of all peoples, but some degree of inclusion of all nations in a single place of worship. Especially when one views the eschatological restoration as a return to the original plan of creation, it would seem to follow that all the children of Adam would walk with God

---

<sup>78</sup> See also Jubilees 36:20, “[Jacob] worshiped the Lord wholeheartedly and in line with the visible commands according to the division of the times of his generation.”

in paradise.<sup>79</sup> Jubilees cuts off this notion at the source. The election of Israel was not God cutting God's losses and focusing on a remnant as the rest of humanity sinned. Rather, the election of Israel was planned from the beginning of creation, and became manifest already in the first week of creation. The restoration, it follows, will fulfill the plan of complete separation of Israel. Furthermore, the degrees of holiness within Israel are typified in the creation of the ranks of angels.

The creation account in Jubilees 2 climaxes not only with the creation of the sabbath, but the designation of the people to observe the sabbath.<sup>80</sup>

[<sup>19</sup>ויאמר לנו הנה אני מבדיל לי] / עם בתווד עממי ו[שבתו הם וקדשתי אתם לי לעם וברכתים והיו עמי והייתי לאלהיהם] / <sup>20</sup>ובחר בזרע יעקוב ב[כל מאשר ראיתי וכתבתי אתו לי לבן בכור וקדשתי אתו לי] / לעולם ועד ואת היום ה[שביעי] אגיד להם לשובתם בו מכל] (4QJub<sup>a</sup> VII:9-12)

[VanderKam and Milik 1994] <sup>19</sup>He said to us: 'I will now separate for myself] a people among my nations. And [they will keep sabbath. I will sanctify them as my people, and I will bless them. They will be my people and I will be their God.] <sup>20</sup>And he<sup>81</sup> chose the descendants of Jacob among [all of those whom I have seen. I have recorded them as my firstborn son and have sanctified them for myself] for all the age(s) of eternity. The [seventh] day [I will tell them so that they may keep sabbath on it from everything'] (Jubilees 2:19-20)

In fact, the sabbath and Israel are practically identified.

[<sup>23</sup>שנים ועשרים ראשי אנשים] / מאדם עד אליו וש<נ>ים ועשרים מ[יני מעשה נעשו עד היום השביעי זה ברוך וקדש וזה ברוך] / וקדש וזה עם זה נעשו יחד לקדש]

---

<sup>79</sup> One should not think that there were only two sets of ideas about universalism: total rejection or total acceptance. One should not conflate the inclusiveness that takes the form of Jews abandoning circumcision, for example, and the inclusiveness that takes the form of asserting that all nations will essentially become Jewish. Jubilees rejects both forms. James C. VanderKam, "Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2," *DSD* 1, no. 3 (1994): 319-321. VanderKam, "Origins and Purposes of Jubilees," 20-22.

<sup>80</sup> This issue has already been elucidated, with extra attention to textual issues by VanderKam, "Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2," 315-321.

<sup>81</sup> The Ethiopic text uses first person forms throughout.

ולברכה <sup>24</sup> וינתן לזה להיות כל הימים ברוכים וקדשים / וזאת התעודה והתורה  
הראשונה] (4QJub<sup>a</sup> VII:14-17)

[VanderKam and Milik 1994] <sup>23</sup>There were twenty-two heads of humanity] from Adam until him; and twenty-two k[inds of work were made until the seventh day. The one is blessed and holy and the other is blessed] and holy. Both (lit., this one with this one) were made together for holiness [and for blessing. <sup>24</sup>It was given to this one to be for all times the blessed and holy ones.] This is the testimony and the fir[st] law [...]  
(Jubilees 2:23-24)

The Ethiopic continues, “as it was sanctified and blessed on the seventh day” **በከሙ** :

**ተቀደሰ : ወተባረከ : በዕለተ : ሳብዕት** (Jubilees 2:24). The election of Israel is not an accident of the deterioration of history, but a central part of the original plan of creation. Furthermore, Israel has exclusive rights to sabbath holiness (Jubilees 2:31).<sup>82</sup> There never was a time when the sabbath was not observed, or was intended to be observed by all nations. Consequently, the eschatological restoration and the fulfillment of the plan of creation is not the universalizing of sabbath observance, but the sanctification of Israel alone in sabbath observance.

The images of eschatological restoration in the rest of the book follow through on the original plan for the eternal separation of Israel (Jubilees 2:33). Numerous passages use language of “eternal” or “forever” to describe the election of the descendants of Jacob (e.g. Jubilees 15:9, 19; 16:26; 22:23; 25:11; 25:20). The central passage on the exclusivity of the relationship between God and Israel (Jubilees 15:30-32) emphasizes the eternality of the distinction. Jubilees 23 describes the restoration with the driving out of

---

<sup>82</sup> VanderKam translates the previous verse about the angels keeping sabbath, “... before it was made known to *all* humanity.” I suggest that the italicized word (**ከሁሉ**) would be better translated as “any of.” The exclusivity of Israel’s sanctification in the sabbath is clear in Jubilees 2:20, 31. Jubilees may partly be reacting to an interpretive problem between the two versions of the Decalogue as to whether the reason for sabbath observance theoretically applies to all creation or only Israel.

the foreign “enemies.” Jubilees 1:22-25 also casts the exclusive relationship between God and Israel in eschatological terms.

The issue is most clear when Jubilees focuses not just on the chosenness of Israel continuing in the restoration, but on the separation of Israel being fulfilled in the restoration. Thus, should one suggest that the other nations could become pure and join an inclusive vision of Israel in the restoration, Jubilees makes clear that integration and purity are fundamentally incompatible. Indeed, impurity and exogamy are identified (Jubilees 30:8). The mixing of types (Israel and the nations) is fundamentally defiling.<sup>83</sup> Jubilees 30:14-15 elevates exogamy to an eschatological issue, identifying exogamy as the root cause of the “final woes” in Jubilees 23,

ወኢይነጽሕ : እስራኤል : እምዝ : ርኩስ : ዘቦ : ብእሲተ : እምነ : አዋልደ :  
 አሕዛብ :: ወእመቦ : እምአዋልዲሁ : ዘወሀቦ : ለብእሲ : እምኩሉ : አሕዛብ :  
 እስመ : መቅሠፍት : ላዕለ : መቅሠፍት : ውእቱ : ወመርገም : ላዕለ :  
 መርገም : ወኩሉ : ኩነኔ : ወመቅሠፍት : ወመርገም : ይመጽእ :: ወለእመ :  
 ገብረ : ዘቃለ : ወለእመ : ተዐወረ : አዕይንቲሁ : እምአሉ : እለ : ይገብሩ :  
 ርኩሰተ : ወእለ : ያረኩሉ : መቅደሶ : ለእግዚአብሔር : ወእምእለ : ይጌምኑ :  
 ስሞ : ቅዳስ : ይትኳነን : ኩሉ : ሕዝብ : ኅቡረ : በእንተ : ኩሉ : ዝርኩስ :  
 ወግማኔ : ዛቲ ::

[JCVK] Israel will not become clean from this impurity while it has one of the foreign women or if anyone has given one of his daughters to any foreign man. For it is blow upon blow and curse upon curse. Every punishment, blow, and curse will come. If one does this or shuts his eyes to those who do impure things and who defile the Lord's sanctuary and to those who profane his holy name, then the entire nation will be condemned together because of all this impurity and this contamination. (Jubilees 30:14-15)

Jubilees is “double-dipping” for explanations of the recent suffering. In Jubilees 23 the direct cause was the Jewish civil war, but here the indirect cause is exogamy. Jubilees

---

<sup>83</sup> This observation about Jubilees has already been made by Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 48.

50:5 resumes the eschatological significance of exogamy by singling out purity among the laws to which Israel returns, bringing about the restoration. The restoration will not transcend the separation of Israel from the nations, it will make the separation absolute.

Although Jubilees emphasizes the holiness barrier between Israel and the nations, it does not challenge the traditional hierarchy in Israel. The issue at hand is not whether one can distill sentiments about priestly groups from the Book of Jubilees,<sup>84</sup> but Jubilees' eschatological endorsement of the traditional hierarchy in general. Jubilees 2 establishes both the hierarchy of angels, and the analogy between angels and humanity. The angels created on the first day follow three degrees of holiness: the angels of the presence have their counterpart in the descendants of Levi; the angels of holiness have their counterpart in the people of Israel; the angels of natural elements have their counterparts in the nations of the world. The first correspondence is made clear in Jubilees 30:18,

**ወተጎርዮ : ዘርእ : ሌዊ : ለክህነት : ወለሌዋዊያን : ከመ : ይትለእኩ : ቅድመ :  
እግዚአብሔር : ከመ : ንሕነ : በኩሉ : መዋዕል ::**

[JCVK] Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. (Jubilees 30:18)

The “we” is spoken by the angel of the presence who dictates to Moses (Jubilees 1:27). The same point is clear in Jubilees 31:14. Again, language of “forever” is used of Levi's elevation in Jubilees 32:1. The second correspondence, between the angels of holiness and the people of Israel, is clear in two passages. The angels of holiness do not serve in the heavenly sanctuary, but they do share with the angels of the presence sabbath

---

<sup>84</sup> In an earlier century one might identify the elevation of Levi as a pan-Levite polemic against priestly supremacy. By the time of Chronicles, however, one could say nice things about the Levites without challenging the structure that distinguished the priests above the Levites. See Chapter 5, note 93.

observance (Jubilees 2:18) and circumcision (Jubilees 15:27).<sup>85</sup> The correspondence between the third tier of angels and the rest of the nations is evident both in the fact that they do not share sabbath observance and circumcision, and in Jubilees 15:31, where God appoints these angels of the spirits to other nations.<sup>86</sup>

The point is that the first day of creation created a hierarchy of heavenly beings that correlates directly to a hierarchy of earthly beings. Hierocracy is not part of the decline of history, but the original plan of creation and a reflection of the heavenly ideal. The eschatological restoration and fulfillment of the original plan of creation will not overthrow the hierocratic structures of authority within Israel, but fulfill them. Although it is important to this chapter to describe the situation with respect to the temporal axis, it has long been observed that Jubilees takes a favorable view of the Jerusalem priesthood (other than recent events).<sup>87</sup> Jubilees 23 in particular does not discuss the eschatological priesthood; yet it is clear from the ranks of angels, the language of “forever,” and the discussion below of God dwelling in the temple, that the Levitical priesthood is fundamental to the plan for the fulfillment of creation.

---

<sup>85</sup> Jubilees 31:14 may call for a moderation of this point. There the Levites are blessed “to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones.” There is at least a difference in language between holy ones (31:14, **ቅዱሳን**) and angels of holiness (2:18, **መላእክተ : ቅድሳት**) or angels of sanctification (15:27, **መላእክተ : ቅዱሴ**). I am not suggesting that there was a clearly articulated and understood distinction between angels of holiness and holy ones (such as the later being a more general category). I am suggesting that the different language in 31:14 reflects a different concern. Jubilees 31:14 is not concerned with ranks of angels and their distinct roles as Jubilees 2 is. This may mean that the author was not obsessed with absolute precision in specifying the ranks of angels in all possible contexts, but it is not a contradiction that requires different authors. At any rate, there is an analogy between the ranks of angels and the ranks of humanity in several passages.

<sup>86</sup> Himmelfarb discusses the correlation between angels and Israel in Jubilees and in a broader context. Martha Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*, Jewish Culture and Contexts (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 53-84. Martha Himmelfarb, “The Book of Jubilees and Early Jewish Mysticism,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming.

<sup>87</sup> Charles, *Jubilees*, lxxiii. For more on the favorable view of Levi, see 5.2.1.4.

**The eschatological restoration in Jubilees will make secure, not dissolve, the geographic borders of Israel.** On one hand, one might expect an apocalypse to imagine an eschatological restoration in which Babel and the division of the nations is undone, either in that all humanity becomes united in religion, or in that Israel conquers the world far beyond its traditional borders. On the other hand, the theology of land in the Pentateuch is specific to one land, and the Deuteronomistic vision of conquest pertains to a particular territory. Although the Ethiopic word ግጥም can mean “earth” in the sense of the whole earth, for some instances I will defend reading the word as “the land” in the sense of the territory of Israel. The eschatological restoration in Jubilees secures the borders and purifies the land of Israel, it does not expand into an empire or open the borders for an international place of worship. I will demonstrate this first from the “original” plan of the division under Noah and the promises to Abraham. Some of the eschatological passages are more textually complicated, but they are best understood as fulfilling, not going beyond, the particular promises for the land of Israel. As in the previous discussion of the holiness of the people, there is also an extent to which degrees of holiness are to be found internally, with Zion holier than the rest of the land. This point will be deferred and treated with the next point, the dwelling of God in the sanctuary.

The division of the land in the days of Noah is eternal, and the promise of land to Abraham applies only to the land of Israel. Jubilees 8 goes to great effort to authorize the right of the descendants of Shem to the land of Israel, and the magnitude of the offense of its theft by Canaan. Again we find language of “eternity” and “forever” used to describe the allotment of territory (Jubilees 8:12; 17, 21). Jubilees also makes clear that “lots” were not random or human arbitrariness, but made certain from prophecy and overseen by an angel of the presence (Jubilees 8:10, 18, 20; 9:15). Of course the main point is that

Israel did not steal, but recovered, the “land of Canaan.” Jubilees makes no effort to qualify the converse, however. For a descendent of Shem to expand into the territory of another would no less bring a curse. The division of territory under Noah and the curse against territorial expansion is valid for all times and peoples, including Israel in the future.

Jubilees also follows Genesis closely in describing the land promised to Abraham and his descendants as the land of Israel, not the whole planet. In no case does Jubilees go out of its way to remove qualifiers such as, “the land which you see,” “where you reside,” “this land,” as one would expect if the author of Jubilees anticipated that the descendants of Abraham would eventually own the whole planet.<sup>88</sup> Following the protological notions of territory, it would be very surprising indeed if Jubilees proposed an eschatological territory of Israel expanded to conquer all lands everywhere.

Two passages in Jubilees suggest that the eschatological restoration restores security of the land of Israel, while another passages, by itself, could be understood as either the land of Israel or the whole earth. A broader reading of Jubilees suggests understanding the ambiguous reading as particular to the land of Israel, not an instance of dissolution or expansion of borders. The first reference comes at the end of the book,

**ወኢየሴይሳታት ፡ የኃልፉ ፡ እስከ ፡ አመ ፡ ይነጽሕ ፡ እሰራኤል ፡ እምኩሉ ፡  
አበሳ ፡ ዝመት ፡ ወርኩስ ፡ ወግማኔ ፡ ወነጢአት ፡ ወጌጋይ ፡ ወየነድር ፡  
ወስተ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ምድር ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትአመን ፡ ወአልቦ ፡ እንከ ፡ ሎቱ ፡ መነሂ ፡  
ሰይጣን ፡ ወአልቦ ፡ መነሂ ፡ እኩየ ፡ ወትነጽሕ ፡ ምድር ፡ እምወእቱ ፡ ጊዜ ፡  
እስከ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ መዋዕል ፡፡**

[JCVK] The jubilees will pass by until Israel is pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin, and error. Then they will live confidently in

---

<sup>88</sup> Jubilees 13:20; 14:7; 15:10; 22:27; 25:17.



the entire land. They will no longer have any satan or any evil person. The land will be pure from that time until eternity. (Jubilees 50:5)

We have already mentioned this passage for the absence of non-human agents on the spatial axis, and appendix 6.6.6 considers what is meant by, “the jubilees will pass by” in light of Leviticus 25. The point now is that the purity and security of the land in the restoration is best understood as referring to the entire land of Israel, not the entire planet earth. There is no suggestion of purity bringing conquest, only the fulfillment of the land promises in the Pentateuch. Another brief, but clear, reference is Jubilees 23:30, where God expels the sinners of the nations. The fact that they are expelled, and not eradicated or reformed, requires that other territories remain home to sinners.

Appendices 6.6.3 and 6.6.4 consider two more complicated cases in greater depth. The first, Jubilees 32:18-19, is a matter of text criticism. While the Ethiopic text of Jubilees 32:18-19 makes Israel sound like an expanding empire, the Latin text does not. Appendix 6.6.3 discusses two reasons to favor a non-imperial reading. Relative to the audience, there is a future reference in Jubilees 32:18-19, but there is also a past reference, to the days of David and Solomon (both are future relative to Jacob). Again, the restoration is a making permanent of the past security and sovereignty of Israel. Appendix 6.6.4 considers Jubilees 4:26, where we have no variant texts to support an emendation. The Ethiopic text claims that the land will be sanctified from Zion. Here the problem is not whether the land of Israel or the whole planet is sanctified, but the fact that sanctification of the land goes beyond biblical precedent. The sanctification of the land will not restore Jewish history as it has already taken place, but it could be understood to fulfill the original plan of creation, as found in the heavenly tablets. The explanation is

difficult, but the basic point is clear: Jubilees imagines a restoration of the traditional borders of the land of Israel, not an expansion or an opening of the borders to foreigners.

**The eschatological restoration in Jubilees will restore, not obviate, the dwelling of God in the traditional sanctuary.** Just as the purity and holiness of the people is true to a higher degree in the priests, the purity and holiness of the land of Israel is true to a higher degree on Mount Zion. The basic idea that Mount Zion would be the particular dwelling of God in the restoration is not controversial by itself. Jubilees 25:21, for example, makes a rather innocuous prophecy that a sanctuary will be built in which God will live with Israel for all ages. The remarkable feature of Jubilees, however is that the “sanctuary that will be built” has two temporal meanings. The revelation of the Book of Jubilees takes place at the time of Exodus 24. Immediately thereafter, Exodus treats the construction of the sanctuary that becomes inhabited in Leviticus 9. The other temporal framework is the mid-second century BCE, at which time the dwelling of God in the temple was hoped for the future.<sup>89</sup> Jubilees describes the dwelling of God in the sanctuary in terms that are both future relative to the second century audience, and immediately future relative to Moses in Exodus 24. The eschatological restoration is in that sense a restoration of past biblical history. This is significant because it implies a very high view of the sanctuary and priesthood of Aaron—they only need to be restored, not surpassed. With this in mind, we can gain a better understanding of one of the passages in Jubilees that has created most difficulty for scholars.

---

<sup>89</sup> A perception that the sanctuary was not properly functioning in the 150s BCE does not imply a negative valuation of the second temple in general. The sources available to us suggest that there was no high priest worth remembering between 159 and 152 BCE. See VanderKam, *Joshua to Caiaphas*, 244-250.

Jubilees 1:29 has an undeniable point of future reference relative to the second century audience, and thus is eschatological in temporal scope. There is a basic sense, however, in which the latter-day eschatological scope is the fulfillment of the former temporal scope. The only amplification of the past in the future, as I read it, is that the dwelling of God in the sanctuary will become permanent. VanderKam emended Jubilees 1:29 to fit expectations for a radical future eschatology. Without the emendation, however, we can see that the anticipated future relative to the second century audience is a mirror of the original progression of history from creation to the dwelling of God in the sanctuary in Leviticus 9. Jubilees 1:29 plays with two temporal meanings, but the simple sense is the immediate future relative to Moses. The allusion to the future relative to the second century audience is unmistakable, but the object is the same in both temporal references. The “eschatological” sanctuary is the same as the sanctuary of Aaron, not a “new” sanctuary, temple or priesthood. Appendix 6.6.5 explains this reading, and hopefully shows how approaching Jubilees without the assumption that it is like other apocalypses gives new understanding to difficult passages.

**The eschatological restoration in Jubilees will restore, not replace, the calendar observed in the past and in heaven.** It is not the case that apocalypses are typically as concerned with calendrical replacement as Jubilees is with calendrical restoration. Even the Astronomical Book (as we have it) suggests only in passing that a new law for heavenly bodies and time keeping will be applicable in the new creation (Astronomical Book 72:1). Yet, it is important to consider this point because, for Jubilees, calendar fits the larger package: the calendar and festivals that are particular to Judaism are not, in fact, particular to Judaism but mirrored in the heavenly tablets and heavenly liturgy. The general issue is whether the eschatological future will replace

Jewish particularism with some form of universalism, i.e., whether Jewish history would end and be replaced with a new universal history. For Jubilees, Jewish particularism, including calendar and festivals, is planned from creation and will be made absolute in the restoration. The basic point is clear in many places in Jubilees.

One should be careful to qualify the calendrical concern of Jubilees. Jubilees is very much concerned with celebrating the festivals at the proper time. Jubilees is also concerned with counting periods of 7 years and 49 years. The major payoff is in the point that the release of Israel from Egypt and return to its land happens in the 50<sup>th</sup> period of 49 years (a jubilee of jubilees comparable to the jubilee year in Leviticus 25).<sup>90</sup> It is not the case, however, that Jubilees serves as a calendrical handbook. Days of the week are among the issues not addressed in Jubilees, unlike 4Q252.<sup>91</sup> Although Jubilees counts 49-year periods from creation through the entry into the land, it does not apparently extend this count to a second jubilee of jubilees, or use larger structures.<sup>92</sup> Thus, although we

---

<sup>90</sup> VanderKam, "Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees," 542.

<sup>91</sup> Ben-Dov, "Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of *Jubilees*," forthcoming.

<sup>92</sup> As tempting as it may be for modern scholars to imagine that Jubilees would have had a chronological scheme for history after Moses, attempts to uncover such a scheme in Jubilees, as thorough as they have been, have essentially proved the hypothesis false. It is one thing when one makes great assumptions that succeed in making sense of otherwise nonsensical data. When great assumptions provide no more clarity than what is assumed, the hypothesis should be rejected.

On a small scale, Michel Testuz tried to piece together various passages in Jubilees into an eschatological scheme and a future periodization of history. He concluded, however, that no such periodization was evident in Jubilees, and if it existed, it existed only as separate secret information in the inner-circles of the sect. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses*, 165-177. As discussed in chapter 5, I disagree with Testuz' conclusion that Jubilees was written by a sect.

James Scott studied the hypothesis on a much larger scale. The thoroughness and skill of his efforts make it clear, to me at least, that if such a structure were to be found, he would have found it. It is not the case that Jubilees synchronizes events with 294-year or 490-year cycles, beyond coincidence and the sources used (pp. 237-249). It is not the case that the periods can be made to fit without overlap (p. 52). It is not the case that the proposed system is manifested in Jubilees itself (p. 149), or makes sense of previously nonsensical passages. It is not the case that Scott can find any evidence in Jubilees for dates of major events such as the restoration of the temple (pp. 148-149). These modest results build on huge

will non-overstate the *type* of calendrical concern in Jubilees, it would be difficult to overstate the *degree* of its concern for the dating of festivals. All the usual modes of emphasis are found: the festivals were practiced by the patriarchs (6:24; 7:3; 14:20; 15:1; 16:20; 18:18; 22:1; etc.), they are ordained on the heavenly tablets (6:35; 16:28; 32:28; 49:8), they are observed by angels (6:18)—all at particular times. From the prologue until the last verse of the last chapter, the heavenly tablets are described as calendrical law for “the divisions of the times.” One repeatedly finds strong language for the permanence of the festival schedule, including “throughout all the years of eternity” (prologue, 6:24), “all the history of the earth” (16:28), and “no temporal limit because it is ordained forever” (16:30; 49:8). Reform or recreation of the festival calendar is not even an eschatological possibility. Israel will synchronize its calendar with heaven, not the earthly standards of other nations.

Another type of calendrical concern in Jubilees is the jubilee *year*. It is clear that Jubilees counts a jubilee of jubilees which fulfills, on the national scale, the release and return of Leviticus 25. Appendix 6.6.6 argues that Jubilees 50 also addresses the 50<sup>th</sup> year, in addition to the 50<sup>th</sup> jubilee. The jubilee year is a clear case of a plan outlined on the heavenly tablets but not (yet) successfully fulfilled in history. Jubilees 50:5 claims that in the restoration Israel will become pure, which will allow the jubilee year to take place as prescribed in Leviticus 25. The counting of a fiftieth epagomenal year is new in

---

assumptions. Although I do like the idea that symmetry and extrapolation are *a priori* likely, Scott pushes the extent to which one can reconstruct an *Endzeit* from an *Urzeit* (p. 156), and the extent to which “rigorous symmetry” is a principle of Jubilees (p. 148). I simply reject the assumptions that Jubilees is an esoteric work of an esoteric milieu (p. 69 n. 119), that Jubilees has the same ideas as those found in Daniel and the Apocalypse of Weeks (74, 102, 128, 156), or later documents found at Qumran (pp. 23-24). Scott also builds mountains on VanderKam’s emendation of Jubilees 1:29 without as much as acknowledging that it is an emendation (p. 73).

the sense that it had not been counted in the past, before Israel became pure.

Nevertheless, it still fits the overarching pattern that the eschatological restoration in Jubilees restores, but does not reform or replace, the original plan of creation found in the heavenly tablets revealed to Moses at Sinai.

#### 6.4.4.3. The periods of history in Jubilees

I have expressed reservations about reconstructing esoteric periods of history that might at best be consistent with an extrapolation from what is actually said in Jubilees.<sup>93</sup> This is not merely the result of epistemological minimalism. I do not think it is an accident that Jubilees is silent on periods of history after Moses. As I have already argued, Jubilees rejects the ideas that judgment or restoration can only happen at predetermined times. The festival calendar is fixed, and the 2450 years of creation reveal some auspicious numbers and chronologies (e.g. 22 items created in the first week, 22 generations until the “creation” of Israel). It does not follow, however, that another cycle of 2450 years, or a more complex alternative, follows the first 2450 years. It is certainly not the case that the creation will ever expire. Thus, there are only two “eras,” the era of creation, and eternity. Everything that was needed for eternity was created in the era of creation, starting with the heavens and the earth, and ending with the creation of God’s dwelling among Israel. It is true that, because of sin, the plan of creation was not immediately fulfilled in the year 2451. The 40 years of study in Jubilees 50:4 took quite a bit longer. Jubilees 1 predicts as much, but is not chronologically determined. Jubilees 1

---

<sup>93</sup> See note 92.

outlines the policy of sin-punishment-repentance-restoration, but it does not fix a time at which restoration will take place independent of human action.<sup>94</sup> The proper study of the laws in Jubilees 23:26, the resumption of study in 50:4, is eschatological in that it resumes the fulfillment of creation and the stabilization of what will be the case for the remainder of eternity. It is significant, however, that this eschatology comes from a very conservative perspective. There is nothing new for the future relative to the audience of Jubilees. The fifty jubilees of creation will not be repeated because creation does not need to be redone.

#### 6.5. Conclusion to the chapter on the temporal axis

Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to convey its view of the temporal axis. Jubilees expresses a transcendent view of the content and meaning of history. Jubilees gives an overarching pattern that includes creation, the present moment of the reader, and the final stabilization of history. Furthermore, Jubilees is comparable to the typical apocalypses in the four major categories of the temporal axis. Jubilees has something to say about the decline of history, the final woes, the judgment and the restoration.

What Jubilees says is significantly different from the typical apocalypses. There is a decline of history that will reverse, but the decline is not recent or exponential. Received scripture indicates that a lifespan of 70-80 years is not the original or final plan, but a punishment for sin. The decline of history, measured in lifespan, is less immediate to the reader’s present. The change mostly took place long ago, and is so gradual that

---

<sup>94</sup> Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 24. “Indeed, none of the [eschatological] passages in *Jubilees* offers anything resembling a timetable in any unit of measurements.”

neither the decline nor restoration can be perceived in a single lifetime. Thus, when Jubilees does address recent events, the events are deprived of the context of a climax of history.

The suffering of “recent” history in Jubilees 23 evokes the final woes of the apocalypses, but differs. Building on the previous chapter, the woes are imposed by God as chastisement for the sin of Israel according to the terms of the covenant. Neither cosmic nor international forces are responsible. Furthermore, the woes are past. Jubilees says the worst is over, whereas apocalypses often say the worst is yet to come.

The change of history does not depend on enduring until God decides to intervene, but the repentance of Israel. When Israel repents God will gradually fulfill the covenantal blessings of life and security in the land. The gentile invaders will be sent home and excluded from the restoration of Israel, but a vengeful judgment is lacking in Jubilees 23. Judgment is an important theme elsewhere in Jubilees, but it is not eschatological. God’s mercy produces only minor delays in punishment, which can occur for any individual or nation at any time. The beginning of the restoration is also realized in the reader’s present. Furthermore, the restoration is, in fact, a restoration, and not a replacement with a new creation. God’s creation is stretched out over 2450 years, not seven days, to include the creation of Israel and the earthly counterpart of the heavenly sanctuary. God’s original plan for creation is good and does not need to be replaced. The particularism of Jewish history was intended all along; it is not a symptom of the decline of righteousness to a remnant. The exclusive covenant does not need to be replaced, the covenantal relationship does not need to extend to the rest of humanity, the borders of the land of Israel will neither be opened nor extended beyond the original plan. The



priesthood and the sanctuary will be restored, not reformed. The calendar that functioned all along in heaven and among the patriarchs will be restored.

For Jubilees, history, and Jewish history in particular, is basically good. History has its ups and downs, but even the recent disaster of the Jewish civil war has meaning according to the idea that suffering comes from God to prompt repentance. Scripture reveals the blessings God has planned for Israel, and the relatively simple plan for bringing it about: study of the laws in general and purity in particular. The broad view of history has its larger “down”, followed by a permanent “up”, but the worldview is basically Deuteronomistic, stretched over the whole of history.

## 6.6. Appendices: Background issues and difficult readings related to the temporal axis

### 6.6.1. The problem of the correlation between longevity and righteousness

Jubilees 23:8-12a deals with the theological problem implicit in the correlation between lifespan and righteousness. At least until the idea of a resurrection allowed some thinkers to dismiss any expectation of justice in this life,<sup>95</sup> a correlation between lifespan and righteousness appears across Jewish thought.<sup>96</sup> The idea that the righteous should (or

---

<sup>95</sup> Daniel 11:33, for example, suggests that the righteous are more likely to die young in this life.

<sup>96</sup> Jubilees 10:16-17 makes the same claim with respect to Noah. In the introduction of the Book of the Watchers joy and length of life are to be expected for the wise, although the expected ideal is corrupted in the present (5:9). Ben Sira takes a more optimistic view of the present, but reflects the same correlation. Suffering and death affect sinners far more than the wise (Sirach 48:8-10). The idea that length of days is a reward for covenantal fidelity is frequently found in Deuteronomy, where variations on *לְהַאריך ימים* appear twelve times, though often qualified, *עַל הָאֲדָמָה*, so as to contrast with exile, not death. The contrast with death appears in Deuteronomy 6:2 and 22:7. See also 1 Kings 3:14; Psalm 91:16; Proverbs 3:2; 3:16; 28:16; and Ecclesiastes 8:13.

do) live longer than the wicked is a common presupposition. Although the progression is smoother in the Samaritan Genesis than the Masoretic text, by all accounts lifespan decreases in general in Genesis.<sup>97</sup> Given the correlation between righteousness and lifespan, a decrease in righteousness would easily follow.

እስመ : መዋዕለ : ቀደምት : እማንቱ : ለሕይወቶሙ : ዐሠርቱ :  
 ወተስዐቱ : ኢየቤልውሳት :: ወእምድኅረ : አይኅ : አኅዙ : ይንትጉ :  
 እምዐሠርቱ : ወተስዐቱ : ኢየቤልውሳት : ወለአኅጽጽ : እምኢየቤልውሳት :  
 ወለረሲእ : ፍጡነ : ወለተጸግዖ : መዋዕሊሆሙ : እምገጸ : ሕማም :  
 ብዙኅ : ወበእከየ : ፍናዊሆሙ : ዘእንበለ : አብርሃም ::

[JCVK] For the times of the ancients were 19 jubilees for their lifetimes. After the flood they started to decrease from 19 jubilees, to be fewer with respect to jubilees, to age quickly, and to have their times be completed in view of the numerous difficulties and through the wickedness of their ways—with the exception of Abraham. (Jubilees 23:9)<sup>98</sup>

The exception becomes a problem for any who view Abraham (175 years) as more perfect than Cain (861-867 years; Jubilees 4:1, 31). In more practical terms, one might expect God’s chosen people to live demonstrably longer than other peoples, or righteous individuals to outlive wicked individuals (even ben Sira avoids saying that the righteous always outlive the wicked).

Cana Werman observed two types of sin and punishment in Jubilees 23.<sup>99</sup> One type is covenantal sin and punishment, which applies only to Israel. The other type is universal sin and punishment, which applies to all people. It seems to follow that in the

---

<sup>97</sup> For the present purposes we need be too concerned with the fact that the lifespans used in Jubilees correspond to those in the Samaritan Pentateuch, or what that may imply about the text or texts of Genesis from which the author worked. See Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 107. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 116-137.

<sup>98</sup> See also Jubilees 4:30, which identifies the death of Adam in less than a full divine “day” (Psalm 90:4) as punishment for sin.

<sup>99</sup> Werman, “ספר היובלים ועדת קומרן,” 43.

latter case a collective punishment of collective sin extends to humanity at large, just as it often does for nations or cities.<sup>100</sup> It is clear that Jubilees is concerned with the problem, but less clear how Jubilees solves it. It does seem that Abraham was exceptional among humanity in righteousness, but nevertheless swept into the collective consequences of collective human wickedness.

እስመ : አብርሃምስ : ፍጹም : በኩሉ : ምግባሪሁ : ምስለ : እግዚአብሔር ::  
 ወእንዘ : ያሠምር : ዘበጽድቅ : ኩሎ : መዋዕለ : ሕይወቱ : ወናሁ : ኢፈጸመ :  
 አርባዕተ : ኢዮቤሉሳተ : በሕይወቱ : እስከ : አመ : ረስኦ : ቅድመ : ገጸ :  
 እከይ : ወጸግበ : መዋዕላቲሁ

[JCVK] For Abraham was perfect with the Lord in everything that he did—being properly pleasing throughout all his lifetime. And yet (even) he had not completed four jubilees during his lifetime when he became old—in view of wickedness—and reached the end of his time.  
 (Jubilees 23:10)

(4Q221 3:1) [א]הן רשע [עד] יום[ב]

The notion that the consequence of general human wickedness is general human mortality fits the data, but the only explicit assertion is that mortality is indeed linked to wickedness, and Abraham was indeed perfect. Whatever the explanation assumed, the resolution of the tension unfolds for the remainder of the chapter, as lifespan and

---

<sup>100</sup> It seems further plausible that the particular sin that would have explained decrease in longevity is calendrical error. Thus, shortening the days of the year (from 364 to 354) by adopting a lunar calendar would have the result of shortening the days of one's life (from 19 jubilees to 1.5). Although the idea that the punishment fits the crime could go without saying, one must keep in mind that it is not said in Jubilees 23. It might also fit the idea of collective punishment, in as much as calendrical convention is fundamentally a communal observance. Since Enoch testified to all the nations about proper calendar, any nation that violated the proper calendar would be subject to punishment (Jubilees 4:18). See also Kugel, "The Jubilees Apocalypse," 331.

Although I am skeptical of interpretations of Jubilees that require a calculator, one might find it interesting that at a rate of deviation of 10 days per year (354 vs. 364 days), by the end of the first jubilee of jubilees (2450 years) the sinners would be off by 67 solar years (69 lunar years). This is not exactly 1.5 jubilees (73.5 years), but one might argue that the punishment fits the crime.

righteousness continue to decline after Abraham before making their eschatological reversal.

#### 6.6.2. Who were the descendents of Lot and Caphtor in the second century BCE?

It lies outside the scope of this study to examine thoroughly the evidence that may indicate what the author of Jubilees or other second century Jews thought happened to the rival nations from patriarchal times. We will review the historical evidence only briefly, which will be enough to suggest that the Moabites and Philistines, like Sodom, could have been understood to have been judged (destroyed or subjugated) in the past, relative to the author of Jubilees. Thus, predictions of their judgment relative to Moses would count as assertions of a rolling policy of judgment, not a deferred future judgment. It is not suggested that Jubilees is *only* explaining past history. The interpretation of Genesis is a far greater factor, which explains why Jubilees is less concerned with other extinct nations.

A brief overview of the historical evidence can put little or no weight on literary or interpretive mentions of ancient peoples. Thus, the mentions of Moab in the War Scroll, 4QTestimonia, and 4QMMT provide little evidence for political realities.<sup>101</sup> Similarly, the perseverance of place names need not tell us much about the continuity of tribal identity, sovereignty, or social relevance.<sup>102</sup> Thus, the regions of Palestine or Moab

---

<sup>101</sup> Yet, the fact that interpreters could shift the designation “Edom” to the Romans, for example, raises questions about how Edom had been previously understood.

<sup>102</sup> For example, the name of the American state “Indiana” may etymologically suggest “land of the Indians,” but one would be wrong to think that Indiana is primarily or at all a place of Indian reservations.

could have been referred to as such long after the Philistines and Moabites ceased to be distinct social or political entities.<sup>103</sup> Josephus provides potential support for the suggestion that at least one of the curses in Jubilees should be understood as fulfilled in the past.

ወአልቦ : ተጎድጎ : ሎሙ : ተረፈ : ወዘይድጎን : አመ : ዕለተ : መፃተ :  
 ኩነኔ :: እስመ : ለሐጉል : ወለሥራዌ : ወለሰስሎ : እምድር : ኩሉ : ዘርአ :  
 ፍልስጥኤም : ወአልቦ : እንከ : ለኩሉ : ክፍቱር : ምንተኒ : ስመ : ዘተረፈ :  
 ወዘርአ : በላዕለ : ምድር

They will have no one left or anyone who is rescued on the day of judgmental anger, for all the descendants of the Philistines (are meant) for destruction, eradication, and removal from the earth. All of Caphtor will no longer have either name or descendants left upon the earth.  
 (Jubilees 24:30)

τῶν δὲ ἄλλων... καὶ Χερθώμου πέρα τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐδὲν ἴσμεν ὁ γὰρ Αἰθιοπικὸς πόλεμος περὶ οὗ δηλώσομεν ὕστερον ἀναστάτους αὐτῶν τὰς πόλεις ἐποίησεν

But the others... and the Caphtorim, we know nothing but their names, for the Ethiopic War,<sup>104</sup> which we will discuss below, made ruin of their cities.  
 (Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.137)

Josephus is not decisive evidence, partly because the destruction of the cities of Caphtor can be distinguished from the annihilation of all the descendents of Caphtor, which includes the Philistines according to Genesis 10:14.<sup>105</sup> In the same passage, Josephus also

---

<sup>103</sup> Thus, for example, Moab in *Bellum* 1:89 and *Antiquities* 13.374 may not be decisive evidence of contemporary politics.

<sup>104</sup> The point is not that Josephus has a satisfactory explanation for when and how they ceased to exist. If the Ethiopic War is to be identified with the account in *Antiquities* 2.238-253, in which Moses leads an Egyptian army against Ethiopia and conquers without a fight by being irresistibly handsome to the Ethiopian princess, we must assume Josephus does not have reliable historical data on the specific events. However unreliable Josephus' explanation may be, the basic fact that the descendents of Caphtor were long forgotten by his time remains certain.

<sup>105</sup> See also 1 Chronicles 1:12. Deuteronomy 2:23 places the Caphtorim in Gaza (cf. Amos 9:7). The Septuagint has "Cappadocians" at Deuteronomy 2:23. Jeremiah 47:4 would place the Caphtorim as alive as of the time of Jeremiah, but not for long thereafter (reading the prophecy as fulfilled).



The books of Maccabees mention neither the Moabites nor the Philistines as contemporary peoples.<sup>109</sup> Nehemiah 13:23 mentions Moabite women, which can probably be explained in reference to Numbers 25:1, rather than contemporary history. One might also consider Daniel 11:41, where the Moabites escape the wrath of Antiochus Epiphanes. It would be impossible to prove that the author of Jubilees could not have identified the descendents of Lot or Caphtor as contemporary enemies. Nevertheless, we certainly have reason to doubt that Jubilees is describing imminent judgment of contemporary enemies, as one might expect from a day of judgment in an apocalypse. We have warrant to suggest rather that Jubilees is primarily dealing with problems in Genesis and perhaps also explaining past history.

#### 6.6.3. Jubilees 32 promises conquest in the land of Israel, not a global empire.

The first of the two complicated cases related to the eschatological status of the land of Israel comes down to a problem of text criticism. While the Ethiopic text of Jubilees 32:18-19 makes Israel sound like an expanding empire, the Latin text does not. There are two reasons to favor a non-imperial reading. First, everything else we have seen in Jubilees suggests a land theology within the traditional borders (the remaining case is difficult for other reasons). Second, the verses in question allude to phrases in

---

One would also need to consider 50:25-26 for how the Philistines function. Di Lella takes “those who live in Philistia” in 50:26 not as a reference to the people subdued by David (2 Sam 5:18-25; 8:1), but “those who have accepted paganism and Hellenization in Palestine.” Di Lella and Skehan, *Ben Sira Commentary*, 558. This would be consistent with *Antiquities* 1.136 mentioned above. Jubilees, however, uses the term to refer to an ethnic group in ancient times.

<sup>109</sup> 1 Maccabees refers to the land of the Philistines as a place name (3:24, 41; 4:22; 5:66, 68).

Deuteronomy that clearly refer to the land of Israel. Although it would not be impossible for Jubilees to reformulate Deuteronomistic land theology into an imperial interpretation, the burden of proof would be on the new interpretation. The Ethiopic text suggests conquering the whole planet, but hardly defends or dwells on the issue. The Ethiopic variant can be explained as an amplification of the promises. A reader who caught the allusions to the promises in Deuteronomy of security in the land of Israel would have been inclined to read the passage as the eschatological fulfillment, not the extension, of covenantal promises.

Jubilees 32:18-19 can be found partly in the one known Latin manuscript, and partly on 4QpapJub<sup>h</sup>. There are of course variants within the Ethiopic texts, but none are particularly helpful here. The evidence is presented here with the two central issues underlined. The translation reflects my proposed changes to VanderKam's translation.

ወይቤሎ : ካዕበ : አነ : ውእቱ : እግዚአብሔር : ዘፈጠርኩ : ሰማየ : ወምድረ :  
 ወአልሀቀክ : ወአበዝነክ : ፈድፋድ : ጥቀ : ወነገሥት : እምኔክ : ይከውኑ :  
 ወይኔንኑ : በኩላሄ : ወእደ : ኬደ : አሰረ : ውሉደ : ሰብእ :: ወእሁብ :  
 ለዘርእክ : ኩላ : ምድረ : ዘመትሕተ : ሰማይ : ወይኔንኑ : ውስተ : ኩሉ :  
 አሕዛብ : በከመ : ፈቀዱ : ወእምድኅረዝ : ያስተጋብኡ : ኩላ : ምድረ :  
 ወይወርስዋ : ለዓለም

32:18 He said to him a second time: ‘I am the Lord who created heaven and earth. I will increase your numbers and multiply you very much. Kings will come from you, and they will rule wherever they set foot against anyone. 32:19 I will give your descendants all of the blessings under heaven. They will rule over all the nations just as they wish. Afterwards, they will gain the entire land, and they will possess it forever’.

[ואת הארץ והפרייתכ]ה והרבייתכה במאוד מאוד ומלכים ממכה יהיו  
 [וימש]ל[ו] בכול מדרוך כף[ו] רגל בני אדם<sup>19</sup> ואתן לזרעכה את כול הארץ אשר תחת  
 [השמים וי]משלו[ו] בכול[ה] [גוים כרצונם ואחר יקחו את כול הארץ וירשוה לעולם]  
 (4QpapJub<sup>h</sup> 1 I:1-3)

32:18 ubicumque fecerint uestigium pedum suorum aduersus filios hominum 32:19 et dabo semini tuo uniuersas benedictiones quaecumque sunt sub caelo et dominabuntur et potestatem exercent in omnibus



gentibus secundum uoluntatem suam et post haec potinebunt uniuersam  
terram et hereditabunt eam in saecula

The first instance is translated by VanderKam, “wherever mankind has set foot.” None of the texts are without difficulty,<sup>110</sup> but it is at least clear that the verse should be understood in light of Deuteronomy 11:24 (also Joshua 1:3),

כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרֹךְ כַּף־רַגְלְכֶם בּוֹ לָכֶם יִהְיֶה  
מִן־הַמִּדְבָּר וְהַלְבָּנוֹן מִן־הַנָּהָר נְהַר־פָּרַת וְעַד הַיָּם הָאֲחֵרִיוֹן יִהְיֶה גְבֻלְכֶם:

[JPS] Every spot on which your foot treads shall be yours; your territory shall extend from the wilderness to the Lebanon and from the River—the Euphrates—to the Western Sea. (Deuteronomy 11:24)

The context makes clear that the promise of conquest pertains to the land of Israel, not the whole earth inhabited by anyone.<sup>111</sup> The Ethiopic text is difficult, and the Latin fits perfectly well with the simple sense of Deuteronomy 11:24. 4QpapJub<sup>h</sup> shows a short reading, making it less likely that Jubilees is placing a new interpretation on the simple sense.<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, the reference to “kings” in this promise to Jacob suggests a promise of the conquest under the Davidic monarchy. Jubilees does not maintain a restored monarchy in its restoration images, so it becomes likely that this promise was understood as fulfilled already in the time of David and Solomon. It is possible that the author of Jubilees imagined (without emphasizing) a restoration of a Davidic monarchy, but even such a restoration would not imply world domination. There is not sufficient

---

<sup>110</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2.213. VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees (DJD 13),” 101.

<sup>111</sup> The phrase *לֹא־אֶתֶּן לָכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ עֵד* also resonates with an even clearer passage, *מִדְרֹךְ כַּף־רַגְלְךָ* (Deuteronomy 2:5). For the peculiar form *מִדְרֹךְ*, see VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees (DJD 13),” 101.

<sup>112</sup> Also, if Jubilees wanted to present an imperial interpretation, other passages, such as Genesis 28:14, would have been better fuel (“Your descendants shall be as the dust of the earth; you shall spread out to the west and to the east, to the north and to the south. All the families of the earth shall bless themselves by you and your descendants”).

evidence to suggest that Jubilees imagined a future series of Jewish kings who would conquer the whole earth.

On the second phrase the texts are clearer, but different. Charles favored the Latin text, “all the blessings under heaven,” whereas VanderKam favored the Ethiopic, “all of the land that is beneath the sky.” VanderKam noted that the passage concerns territory, both in Jubilees 32 and Genesis 35. Yet, there is a logical problem with this reading. If God gives Israel the whole planet earth, what would it mean two sentences later when they gain the entire earth/land? It is not just a matter of redundancy, since sequence is suggested by **ወእምድኒረዝ** “afterwards, after this.” One might reconstruct a long text (all the blessings of the earth under the heaven) from which both could be derived by dropping a word. Yet, VanderKam’s reasoning for favoring the Ethiopic serves as a reasonable explanation for how the Ethiopic tradition could have accidentally replaced “blessings” with “land.” There is nothing unusual about a passage dependent on Deuteronomy treating land and blessings together. One finds language of “under heaven” in Deuteronomy with reference to conquest of the land of Israel, not other lands. So especially,

הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֶחֱלֶה לָתֵת פַּחַדְךָ וְיִרְאַתְךָ עַל־פְּנֵי הָעַמִּים תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמְעוּן  
שְׁמֶעְךָ וְרָגְזוּ וְחָלְוּ מִפְּנֶיךָ:

[JPS] This day I begin to put the dread and fear of you upon the peoples everywhere under heaven, so that they shall tremble and quake because of you whenever they hear you mentioned. (Deuteronomy 2:25)

וְנָתַן מַלְכֵיהֶם בְּיָדְךָ וְהָאֲבֹדֶת אֶת־שֵׁמָם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם לֹא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנֶיךָ עַד  
הַשְׁמָדֶךָ אֹתָם:

[JPS] He will deliver their kings into your hand, and you shall obliterate their name from under the heavens; no man shall stand up to you, until you have wiped them out. (Deuteronomy 7:24)

The language of “blessings under heaven” (associated with Jacob<sup>113</sup>) could also come from,

מֵאֵל אֲבִיךָ וְיַעֲזֹרְךָ  
וְאֵת שְׁדֵי וְיִבְרַכְךָ  
בְּרִכַּת שָׁמַיִם מֵעַל  
בְּרִכַּת תְּהוֹם רַבְּצָת תַּחַת  
בְּרִכַּת שְׁדִים וְרַחֵם:

[JPS] The God of your father who helps you,  
And Shaddai who blesses you  
With blessings of heaven above,  
Blessings of the deep that couches below,  
Blessings of the breast and womb. (Genesis 49:25)

The addition of תחת השמים would not suffice if Jubilees intended to convert the promises of security in the land of Israel into promises of global conquest. The Latin text makes perfect sense, and fits the pattern we have been considering. The Ethiopic text, as we have it, suggests territorial conquest beyond the traditional boundaries of Israel, which would certainly be a hope that was never realized in the past. This would be a departure from what we have found in the rest of Jubilees. By following the Latin text, we find yet another instance of a promise that may be expected to be permanently realized in the future, but was also realized in the past. God promised Jacob that his descendents would gain sovereignty and security in the Land of Israel. This promise was at least temporarily fulfilled in the past, under Solomon. There is still a future, eschatological dimension but it is a restoration of past biblical history, not a rejection and replacement with a new and different history.

---

<sup>113</sup> Following Kugel’s case that Jubilees 23 explains how Moses received as revelation Psalm 90, Jubilees 32 could explain how Jacob received as revelation Genesis 49. One might also find some consonance with Genesis 49:10 in Jubilees 32:18, although Genesis 35:11 suffices for the basic idea. More evidence would be necessary to establish the likelihood of such a possibility. Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” 322-337.

#### 6.6.4. The sanctification of the land

The second half of Jubilees 4:26 is attested only in Ethiopic (the first half appears in the Syriac chronicle). The unsurprising part is that Mount Zion will be sanctified in the “new creation.” It was sanctified before and one would expect it to re-sanctified as part of any restoration. The difficulty is that Mount Zion (presumably the cult of the temple) in turn sanctifies the rest of the land.

ወደብረ : ጽዮን : ይትቂደስ : በፍትረት : ሐዳስ : ለቅዳሴ : ምድር : በእንተዝ :  
ትትቂደስ : ምድር : እምኩሉ : አበሳ : ወእምርኩሳ : በትውልደ : ዓለም ::

and Mt. Zion (which) will be sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the land. For this reason the land will be sanctified from all its sins and from its uncleanness during the generations of eternity.  
(Jubilees 4:26)

I have adapted VanderKam’s translation from “earth” to “land,” but this hardly begins to resolve the problem. The priestly source has a high view of the importance of the central cult, but nowhere, and certainly not in the holiness code, does one find the idea that sacrifice can purify, let alone sanctify, the land.<sup>114</sup> Although people can be purified, atoned for, and sanctified by cultic ritual, this would be new for the land. It may be tempting to emend to “purify”, since one would not *sanctify* from sins and uncleanness, not matter what the object, but one would have to emend twice without manuscript support. Even with such an emendation, it would be more than a restoration of precedent

---

<sup>114</sup> In Numbers 35:33 only the blood of the perpetrator atones for the defilement of the land through moral impurity. In Leviticus 18:29 the only resolution of defiled land is *karet*. Deuteronomy 21 addresses moral impurity without mention of the land, but refers to a specific case of an unknown slayer. In Deuteronomy 32:43 God “atones” for the land by killing enemies (כִּפֹּר אֲדִמָּתוֹ עִמּוֹ), but the subject is still not Mount Zion and the verb is still not sanctify. Ezekiel 39:11-16 plays upon, but does not contradict, the distinction between moral and ritual purity. The death of Gog corrects moral impurity, whereas the burial of corpses pertains to ritual impurity. See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 31.

if the Jerusalem cult purifies the land. Emending “land” to “people” might make more sense, but again would have to happen twice without manuscript support.

The safe conclusion is the general qualification that the restoration in Jubilees goes beyond biblical history in asserting the ability of Mount Zion to purify or sanctify the land. This would moderate the extent to which we can claim that the restoration does not go beyond restoring what already existed in the past. The author of Jubilees could have held, however, that the sanctification of the land fulfilled the original plan of creation. An explanation of how the author might have defended this claim in received scripture, however, would require some speculation.

As discussed in appendix 6.6.6, one major plan of creation that is explicit in the “heavenly tablets” but apparently never fulfilled in history is the release of the fiftieth year, as outlined in Leviticus 25. It may have been analogously fulfilled in the release and return of Israel in the jubilee of jubilees, but the fiftieth *year* was not recorded to have successfully taken place. The fiftieth year release, appendix 6.6.6 suggests, was a plan to be fulfilled in the future days of purity. It is tempting to find a connection between the hope for purity, release and return, and the hope for sanctification of the land.

וְקִדְשְׁתֶּם אֶת שְׁנַת הַחֲמִישִׁים שָׁנָה וְקִרְאתֶם דְּרוֹר בְּאֶרֶץ לְכָל-יֹשְׁבֶיהָ  
(Leviticus 25:10)

In the simple sense, the year, not the land, is sanctified. Yet, according to Jubilees 50:5 (see appendix 6.6.6), the fiftieth year is dependent upon the purity of the land. It would only be one extra step if the release proclaimed from Zion were to sanctify not only the year, but the land and inhabitants as well. Purity does not create sanctity, but it is a prerequisite for it. Numbers 35:34 would help make the “leap” from purity to sanctity, since any place God dwells would become holy,

וְלֹא תִטְמָא אֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם יֹשְׁבִים בָּהּ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שֹׁכֵן בְּתוֹכָהּ  
(Numbers 35:34)

If Israel keeps the land pure, and God dwells in the land of Israel, one might imagine that the whole land would become holy.

At any rate, the eschatological restoration in Jubilees is the restoration and making permanent of the original plan of creation. For the most part, this plan has some precedent for actually occurring. Two items, however, had not occurred in the past: the successful observance of the jubilee year (proclaimed from Zion), and the sanctification of the land from Zion. It would be tempting but speculative to connect these two items on the basis of Leviticus 25:10.

6.6.5. Jubilees 1:26-29 identifies the indwelling of the sanctuary in the restoration with the indwelling of the sanctuary of Aaron.

The first key to understanding Jubilees 1:29 is to observe that it is the last of three formulations of the scope of the book. The double-meanings of Jubilees 1:29 could have been confusing to the ancient audience, as they have been to modern scholars, but Jubilees 1:26-28 should help the reader. In the first formulation, God commands Moses to write down the Book of Jubilees. In the second, God commands the angel of the presence to dictate to Moses the Book of Jubilees. Finally, Jubilees 1:29 describes the scope of the tablets which the angel dictated to Moses. While the third may add an eschatological twist on the first two formulations, it does not contradict them. In all three cases the scope of the book is from Genesis 1, up to (but excluding) Exodus 25—Leviticus 9, i.e., through Exodus 24. In other words, the book covers from the creation up to (not through) the building and indwelling of the sanctuary of God in the midst of

Israel. Besides the consistency of the three iterations, the actual book supports this observation;<sup>115</sup> Jubilees narrates the time from creation through Exodus 24.<sup>116</sup> The addition of an eschatological, permanent dimension adds to but does not negate the basic sense. The dwelling of God among Israel will happen again and will happen permanently, but it has already happened and will basically be the fulfillment, not replacement, of the plan in the heavenly tablets (a.k.a. the priestly source) for the priesthood and sanctuary of Aaron.

The first of three iterations clearly states the scope, up to the indwelling of the sanctuary, **እስከ : ሶባ : እወርድ : ወእነድር : ምስሌሆሙ : በኩሉ : ዓለሙ : ዓለም** “until the time when I descend and live with them throughout all the ages of eternity” (Jubilees 1:26).<sup>117</sup> As it happens, the indwelling that began in Leviticus 9 was interrupted by sin, but it was intended then for all eternity and will happen again successfully. Jubilees 1:26 cannot be understood to mean that the Book of Jubilees will chronicle all the events of all time, but only the divisions of time which are to be for all time, and the events from creation until the *original* sanctuary. The implication that the same laws about the division of time will continue for all time is certainly sincere, but if there is a resonance with language typical of the apocalypses in **ዘቀዳሚ : ወዘደኃሪ** “what is first and what is

---

<sup>115</sup> VanderKam deals with the problem that the actual scope of Jubilees does not support the reading that Jubilees 1:26, 29 refer exclusively to an “end.” However, even with chapter 23, Jubilees does not include the contents of all of history. Many passages in Jubilees claim to give the laws and chronological structure that will apply to all of history, but not the specific events. Jubilees 1, like Deuteronomy, predicts a pattern of sin, punishment, repentance and restoration, but is hardly a predetermined chronology. Deuteronomy and Jubilees 1 support the idea that Moses received some sense of what would happen to Israel in the future, but not specific chronology of events. VanderKam, “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1,” 272-273.

<sup>116</sup> VanderKam, “Scriptural Setting,” 61-72.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Exodus 25:8, **וַעֲשׂוּ לִי מִקְדָּשׁ וְשָׁכְנָתִי בְּתוֹכָם**; Also, Ex. 29:45; Num. 5:3; 35:34.

last,” it might be ironic, since Jubilees does not really develop an end of time *per se*, even in chapter 23.<sup>118</sup> Chronicles shows that “first and last” can simply mean, “complete contents (of a book),” without the later connotation of an end of the cosmos.<sup>119</sup>

The second iteration states even more clearly and succinctly the scope of the Book of Jubilees as it is carried out in the rest of the book,

ወይቤሎ : ለመልአክ : ገጽ : ጸሐፍ : ለሙሴ : እምቀዳሚ : ፍትረት : እስከ :  
አመ : ይትሐነጽ : መቅደስየ : በማእከሎሙ : ለዓለመ : ዓለማት ::

Then he said to an angel of the presence: “Dictate to Moses (starting) from the beginning of the creation until the time when my sanctuary is built among them throughout the ages of eternity.” (Jubilees 1:27)

I have adapted VanderKam’s translation only to use the more inclusive term “sanctuary” instead of “temple.” Again, it is true that the sanctuary built among Israel in Exodus 25—Leviticus 9 did not persist uninterrupted for eternity, but it was planned for eternity and the same basic plan will become stable for eternity. The next verse goes on to connect the theophany in Leviticus 9 with the theophany in 2 Chronicles 7:3, on Mount Zion. The long-term plan for the dwelling of God in the holy place indeed refers to Zion and

---

<sup>118</sup> In the Latin text of Jubilees 45:14 Jacob informs his children what would happen to them in their last days in the land of Egypt, which is to say, the Exodus. The Ethiopic duplicates “what would happen to them” so that Jacob tells them *both* what would happen to them in Egypt *and* what would happen to them in the last days (although Ethiopic manuscripts 21, 35 and 63 omit the conjunction). Scribal error could go in either direction (duplicating or dropping), but two factors are decisive in favor of the Latin. First, Jubilees does not use the language or the idea of “last days” or “end of time” in chapter 23. Indeed, history changes course when Israel repents, but history never ends. Second, the passage in Jubilees is based on Genesis 49, but *removes* all the predictive content. At best, Jubilees would be acknowledging an eschatological prediction, not retelling or expanding it. It is much more likely, however, that Jubilees used the phrase בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים from Genesis 49:1 in the basic sense of “in days to come,” i.e. the time to come in Egypt. The eschatological use of the phrase explains why later transmitters would give it an “end of time” meaning that was not operative in the original composition. Another possible sense would be “in the last days of the era,” which would mean the same thing since the first era of 2450 years ends with the Exodus and journey in the desert.

<sup>119</sup> Deutero-Isaiah notwithstanding (41:4; 44:6; 48:12), the phrase could simply refer to completeness in treating the subject matter, as it does frequently in Chronicles (1 Chron 29:29; 2 Chron 9:29; 12:15; 16:11; 20:34; 25:26; 26:22; 28:26; 35:27).



Jerusalem, but that addition does not negate the connection to the immediate fulfillment in the time following the revelation of the book of Jubilees to Moses. The building of the sanctuary has two temporal meanings: the simple sense of the time of Exodus 25, and the permanent sense future relative to the audience. There is only one object, however.

Jubilees identifies the eternal sanctuary as the sanctuary of Aaron.

Jubilees 1:29 pushes further the polyvalence, but we should not emend away the basic meaning that the scope of Jubilees is from the creation in Genesis 1 up to the indwelling of God in Exodus 25—Leviticus 9. The future relative to the second century audience is a restoration of the immediate future relative to Moses. It is important to recognize the multiple connotations of “making new”. In one sense, the creation in Genesis 1 was making new. In another sense the priestly cult of Aaron has cosmic significance for atonement and renewal. In yet another sense the eschatological future relative to the audience will be a renewal. All three senses are active in Jubilees 1:29. The basic “from... until” structure can be aligned with the previous two iterations and the actual contents of the rest of the book. There are two “from” clauses, which iterates that the heavenly tablets existed from the beginning of creation. Both refer to the creation as described in Genesis 1. First comes the claim that the law, testimony and calendar of the heavenly tablets existed from creation:

... እምአመ : ፍጥረተ : ሕግ : ወለስምዕ : ለሱባዔሁ : ለኢዮቤልዎን : በበ :  
ዓመት : በኩሉ : ፕልቆሙ : ወኢዮቤልዎን ...

...from the time the law and the testimony were created—for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number, and their jubilees...  
(Jubilees 1:29)

Although Genesis does not make clear that the law was created at or before the creation of the world, Jubilees is not alone in this perspective.<sup>120</sup>

The second “from” clause is, in a sense, a more conventional way of referring to creation of the heavens and earth as it is known in Genesis 1. In another sense, the text as we have it seems to go beyond the creation in Genesis 1. Although previous scholars have felt compelled to emend, another way to make sense of the text is to understand “creating new” at multiple levels. Thus, the *terminus a quo* of Jubilees is still the original creation.

... እምዕለተ : ፍጥረት : ሐዳስ : አመ : ይትሐደስ : ሰማያት : ወምድር :  
ወኩሉ : ፍጥረቶሙ...

... from the time of new creation, when the heavens become new, along  
with the earth, and all their creatures... (Jubilees 1:29)

Without context or emendation, the most straightforward translation of this phrase would be eschatological, as if Jubilees were to narrate starting with a time future relative to Moses and the second century audience.<sup>121</sup> The immediate context and the actual contents of the book discords with such an understanding, and thus demands an alternative understanding of ambiguous terms and non-perfective conjugation.<sup>122</sup> I am not

---

<sup>120</sup> With the help of Proverbs 8:22, Wisdom and vicariously Torah were considered the prerequisites of creation. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 54.

<sup>121</sup> Thus it is on the basis of context, rather than grammar, that I seek a more ambiguous or neutral translation than that of VanderKam, “from... the time of the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures will be renewed [subjunctive].” The bigger difference is that VanderKam inserts an emendation, “[the time of the creation until].” Although not supported by manuscripts, the emendation is a reasonable attempt to make simple sense of the passage. I suggest that the passage has a complex but meaningful sense without emendation.

<sup>122</sup> Lambdin suggests using the English past tense to translate an Ethiopic subjunctive subordinate to a past frame of reference. Thomas Oden Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge’ez)*, Harvard Semitic Studies 24 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 437. In the present circumstance, the joy is in the multi-valence, since to “become new” is not clearly marked as past or future.

suggesting that this is a *simple* way of referring to the creation in Genesis 1. I am suggesting that Jubilees is intentionally playing against an understanding of “new creation” which suggests that the first creation was flawed. The heavens and earth were already made new in the original creation. Any other new creation will be a restoration, not a rejection of the original new creation in Genesis 1.<sup>123</sup>

A further assertion about the original creation has perplexed scholars. VanderKam is justified in departing from the base manuscript (25) to include **ለሰማይ** “with respect to heaven, heavenly” (manuscript 35). The meaning, however, does not make sense with VanderKam’s emendation, as he has the verse reading “the creatures of the earth will be renewed... like the creatures of the earth.” I suggest that Jubilees is saying here what it says elsewhere, that there is a correlation between heavenly beings and earthly beings.<sup>124</sup> The lower angels maintain the forces of nature and govern the other nations, the angels of holiness mirror the people of Israel (without mediating sovereignty), and the angels of the presence mirror the Levites.

... በከመ : ኀይላቲሆሙ : ለሰማይ : ወበከመ : ኩሉ : ፍጥረተ : ምድር...

... in accordance with the heavenly powers, to each an earthly creature...  
(Jubilees 1:29)

This correspondence refers to an aspect of the original creation in Jubilees 2.

Finally, we come to the easy part, the “until” clause. Although the sanctuary was restored several times in Jewish history, its “creation” refers primarily to the time of

---

<sup>123</sup> The same term **ፍጥረት : ሐዳስ** “new creation” appears in the sense of restoration, not replacement, of the past creation in Jubilees 5:12, where it is translated by VanderKam as “new... nature.” There the context is the “day of judgment” which was the flood, **ወገብረ : ለኩሉ : ግብሩ : ፍጥረተ : ሐዳስ : ወጻድቅተ**, literally, “And God made for all God’s works a new and righteous creation.” Again, the “day of judgment” and “new creation” here are past relative to Moses.

<sup>124</sup> See the discussion of Deuteronomy 32:8; 4:19; 29:25 in 5.1.3, “Angelic Mediation.”

Moses and Aaron.<sup>125</sup> Thus, in the simple sense, the temporal extent of the book is up to the creation of the sanctuary.

... እስከ : አመ : ይጉፈጠር : መቅደስ : እግዚአብሔር

... until the time when the sanctuary of the Lord will be created.  
(Jubilees 1:29)

This basic “until” clause matches perfectly with the previous two iterations, and the actual scope of the book. None of this is to deny that Jubilees is playing on multiple temporal levels. Moses’ reception of the heavenly tablets in Exodus 24 is followed by the creation and indwelling of God in the sanctuary, and the obvious analogy is that the study of the heavenly tablets in the time of the audience will lead directly to the renewal of the sanctuary and indwelling of God. The plan for restoration is a return to the plan of creation laid out from the beginning of creation through the time the heavenly tablets were fully revealed to Israel at Sinai. This first era, the jubilee of jubilees, provides the plan for eternity. The future will stabilize and fulfill, not supersede the original plan.

Jubilees 1:29 goes on to include the subsequent plan for the sanctuary. Here we see as strongly as ever the very high opinion that Jubilees has for the priestly cult. Purity is a prerequisite for the sanctuary, but once the sanctuary is in operation it has power to benefit not only Israel, but the luminaries (the opposite direction of influence as one typically finds in apocalypses).

---

<sup>125</sup> Exodus and Leviticus do not use the root בָּרָא to refer to the construction of the sanctuary, but for Jubilees the original and final constructions of the sanctuary are identified as part of the fulfillment of creation. The Temple Scroll also speaks of the sanctuary as something created by God (29.8-10). Eyal Regev argues that this passage in the Temple Scroll is dependent on Jubilees. Eyal Regev, “Jubilees, Qumran and the Essenes,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)* (2007), forthcoming. Isaiah 4:5 would also be relevant to a consideration of “creation” in relationship to the sanctuary.

በኢየሩሳሌም : በደብረ : ጽዮን : ኩሉ <sup>126</sup> : ብርሃናት : ይትገልጽ : ለፈውስ :  
 ወለሰላም : ወለበረከት : ለኩሉሙ : ጎሩያነ : እስራኤል : ወከመ : ይኩን :  
 ከማሁ : እምይኢቲ : ዕለት : ወእስከ : ኩሉ : መዋዕለ : ምድር ::

In Jerusalem, on Mount Zion, all the luminaries will be made new for healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel, so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth.  
 (Jubilees 1:29)

Jubilees 19:25 also conveys the idea that Israel renews the luminaries and makes firm the earth. The priestly cult never realized its full potential in the past, but once rolling properly will create a self-sustaining cycle. Mount Zion benefits the luminaries, which benefit Israel,<sup>127</sup> which maintains the cult.<sup>128</sup> After a few false starts, the same basic cult will get running and continue for all time.

#### 6.6.6. The fiftieth year in Leviticus 25 and Jubilees 50

The Book of Jubilees uses the term “jubilee” to describe a 49-year period. In Leviticus 25 the jubilee is the release and return in the fiftieth year. The number “fifty” appears in Jubilees in the counting of the fifty jubilees that form the scope of the book, culminating in a jubilee of jubilees of release and return (from Egypt to the ancestral land).<sup>129</sup> Although can one list multiple instances when Jubilees departs from narrative

---

<sup>126</sup> I read with manuscripts 39, 42 and 48 against VanderKam’s base text (25) in omitting a conjunction before “all.” I am also disregarding the punctuation, which is not included in the critical apparatus. It would not be impossible to read this clause with the preceding sentence, but I do find it helpful to distinguish the creation of the sanctuary from its later development. One must also be suspect of short, unnecessary phrases that could be explained as anti-Samaritan polemic which could have been inserted during the early transmission of Jubilees.

<sup>127</sup> See 5.2.1.4 for how the phrase “elect ones of Israel” cannot refer to a sect. If it is original it could mean that all Israel is elect, or it could refer to the Levites.

<sup>128</sup> Fletcher-Louis includes Jubilees 19:25 as an example of the relationship between temple and cosmos, or “temple cosmology.” Fletcher-Louis, “Jewish Apocalypticism,” (near the end).

<sup>129</sup> VanderKam, “Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees,” 543.

and legal material in the known versions of received scripture, I suggest we should think twice before concluding that Jubilees simply dismisses the idea of the fiftieth *year*. The jubilee law of Leviticus 25 was never known to have actually been observed in biblical history, since Jeremiah 34 reflects a failed attempt. Furthermore, Numbers 36:4 suggests a conditional observance (וְאִם־יְהִיָּה הַיָּבֵל לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). It seems likely that Jubilees did not simply dismiss the fiftieth year of Leviticus 25, but read it as a conditional blessing. Unlike the sabbath, which is counted even if it is not observed, the jubilee year does not even occur unless Israel is pure. The first 2450 years were creation in a broad sense, culminating with the completion of the covenant, law and sanctuary in Israel. Thereafter, the jubilee year, like the other covenantal blessings, will be fulfilled whenever Israel is worthy. In all Israel's ups and downs, from Joshua into the second century, the conditions for the blessing were never met, but would be met as part of the restoration.

Besides Numbers 36:4, the conditional nature of the fiftieth year release can be found in Leviticus 25 and Jubilees 50. First, Leviticus 25 begins with the condition, כִּי תָבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ “when you enter the land,” so it is expected that there would be no fiftieth year in the first 2450 years of creation. Leviticus 25:18-22 suggests a chain of conditions and effects: observing the laws faithfully causes living in security in the land and a three-fold crop, which allows observance of sabbatical and jubilee years. Thus, one cannot observe the jubilee until one has a three-fold crop, and one does not get a three-fold crop until one observes the laws faithfully. Furthermore, at least logically, the fiftieth year

return requires the cooperation of all landowners in the land of Israel—a condition not met at the time of composition.<sup>130</sup>

In Jubilees, as in Leviticus 25, the fiftieth year jubilee is promised for the future relative to Moses. There was no fiftieth year in the 2450 years of creation, but it will exist in the future, having been revealed for the first time to Moses.<sup>131</sup>

ወሰንበታተ : ምድርኒ : ነገርኩክ : በደብረ : ሲና : ወዓመታተ : ኢየሴሌዎኒ :  
ወስተ : ሰንበታተ : ዓመታት : ወዓመቶሰ : ኢነገርናክ : እስክ : አመ :  
ትበውሉ : ወስተ : ምድር : እንተ : ትእዝተ : ወታሰነብት : ምድርኒ :  
ሰንበታተሃ : በነቢዮቶሙ : ዲቤሃ : ወዓመቶ : ለኢየሴል : ያእምሩ ::

Both the sabbaths of the land, and the years of the jubilee in which are weeks of years [i.e. the 49 year period] I told you about on Mount Sinai. But the *year* of the jubilee [i.e., the fiftieth year release], however, we did not tell you about, until the time when you enter into the land of which you will take possession. The land will keep its sabbaths in their dwelling on it, but they are to know [i.e., they are responsible for] God's year for the jubilee. (Jubilees 50:2-3)

As Jeremiah 34 and common sense make clear, they did not know God's year for the jubilee. Leviticus 25:18 stated the conditions for realizing the jubilee more generally as keeping the laws. Jubilees 50:5 adds some specificity: purity is the main concern that has not yet happened and needs to happen before there can be a year of release.

ወኢየሴሌዎታት : የኅልፉ : እስክ : አመ : ይነጽሕ : እሰራኤል : እምኩሉ :  
አበሳ : ዝሙት : ወርኩስ : ወግማኔ : ወነጢአት : ወጌጋይ : ወየኅድር :  
ወስተ : ኩሉ : ምድር : እንዘ : ይትአመን : ወአልቦ : እንክ : ሎቱ : መነሂ :  
ሰይጣን : ወአልቦ : መነሂ : እኩየ : ወትነጽሕ : ምድር : እምውእቱ : ጊዜ :  
እስክ : ኩሉ : መዋዕል ::

[JCVK] The jubilees will pass by until Israel is pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin, and error. Then they will live confidently in

---

<sup>130</sup> Leviticus 25:23 suggests that even Jews do not really *own* land in Israel, but merely lease it from God. Thus the conditions of Jubilees 23:26-30 must go together. Not only must non-Jews leave the land of Israel, Jews must recognize that even they have only provisional ownership of the land.

<sup>131</sup> Jubilees 36:20 may support the possibility that the division of the times in Jacob's generation is not the same as the division after all the commandments become visible at Sinai.

the entire land. They will no longer have any satan or any evil person. The land will be pure from that time until eternity. (Jubilees 50:5)

One should not read “the jubilees will pass by” to mean simply that “time will pass by,” but rather that the fiftieth year release will be denied Israel until they enter the land and meet the condition of purity.<sup>132</sup>

The fiftieth year would not be an eschatological change in calendar, but the fulfillment of a promise made at Sinai. The conditions for דרור “release” according to Jubilees on the basis of Leviticus 25 differ from the conditions in Isaiah 61. In Isaiah the release is a proclamation initiated by God with no conditional requirements. According to Jubilees, the release was proclaimed long ago at Sinai, and the ball is in Israel’s court. As soon as they meet the condition of observing the laws faithfully the release will come about. Isaiah 61 and Jubilees 50 approach Leviticus 25 with very different worldviews.

---

<sup>132</sup> In light of Jubilees 30:14-15, purity is to be understood here as purity from exogamy (see above, page 423). Jubilees 50:5, combined with Jubilees 30:14-15, forms something of a parallel to Jubilees 23. Jubilees 30 gives an additional explanation of the “curses” of recent history. The Jewish civil war was a direct cause, but exogamy was the indirect cause. Jubilees 30:14-15 uses ideas and language almost identical to Jubilees 23, “blow upon blow, curse upon curse, every punishment, blow and curse will come,” “defile the Lord’s sanctuary and profane God’s holy name,” “the entire nation will be condemned together.” Jubilees 50:5, in turn, provides a parallel to the restoration in Jubilees 23, emphasizing that purity from exogamy must be addressed in particular. Here the rewards of security and lack of “any satan or evil person” reference the restoration in Jubilees 23. In that sense Leviticus 25 is read as an “eschatological” law for the time when Israel will obey the laws in general and avoid exogamy in particular.



## CHAPTER 7

### REVIEW OF IRONIC USE OF THE GENRE “APOCALYPSE” IN JUBILEES

The previous chapters examined in depth the worldview of Jubilees in three abstract categories derived from the definition of the literary genre. In the interest of synthesis, we will now review some key passages in the sequence experienced by the reader—the order of the book. The previous chapters also avoided speculation into authorial intent. By adding a few additional suggestions, we will venture into some more speculative questions. Can the pattern observed be explained as coincidence and the by-product of other concerns, or does the quantity and strength of examples suggest a deliberate use of genre? Does the author present the different options as reconcilable or as opposites?

For some scholars these questions need hardly be asked. If Jewish intellectuals were clearly divided into camps for and against the apocalyptic worldview, then any indication of allegiance or greater sympathy would seal the case that the author promoted one and polemicized against the other. Thus, even a subtle hint would have been unmistakable enough to an audience attuned to the fundamental differences in worldview. Furthermore, if the intellectual differences were sealed in social reality—sects, factions, and militias—derisive polemic would be far more likely than harmonization. For our purposes, it is not necessary to defend any overarching models of social and intellectual

history in second century BCE Judaism. It is not necessarily the case that lines were clearly drawn and rifts divided ideas and people. It is not necessarily the case that the apocalyptic worldview was tied to a particular group, or that a single text defined orthodoxy for the worldview. It is the case that a cluster of compatible ideas are conveyed by the early apocalypses, and Jubilees departs from that cluster.

Jubilees imitates the apocalypses on the surface level of literary genre, but argues against the ideas typically conveyed thereby. We can never be certain of the intent of the author, but we can establish probability. The author brought together different literary genres, but if the author intended to harmonize ideas or groups, then the compromise was very one-sided. Whatever compromises might be found in Jubilees are dwarfed by the subversion of the apocalyptic worldview. The basic tenets of the worldview are caricatured, inverted, and refuted. It is unlikely that one invested in the ideas of the Animal Apocalypse would have accepted Jubilees merely because of the use of literary genre. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the author intended a harmonization.

It is much more difficult to define, classify, and establish humor and ridicule. The evidence and argumentation of the present work do not justify a firm conclusion that the literary irony was intended to ridicule the apocalyptic worldview and parody the apocalypses. As we review the ironic use of the literary genre we will consider some moments that might be consistent with some form of satire.<sup>1</sup> It is left for the individual reader, or perhaps a future work, to conclude what type of satire, if any, might have been intended by the ancient author.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 1, note 10 for the classification of Horatian and Juvenalian satire.

### 7.1. Jubilees 1, the framework

The ironic use of the genre “apocalypse” is not limited to any small number of passages. Jubilees 23 may be the central case in multiple senses, but the framework is clearly established at the beginning and end of the book and multiple instances throughout. The first chapter of Jubilees establishes clearly the framework of the genre “apocalypse.” It may be less obvious from the opening chapter that the worldview is inverted. It is certainly possible that a reader would not have realized until later that the genre was being used ironically, although I favor the probability that a savvy reader would have picked up even the more subtle clues in the first chapter. We will consider two ways in which the first chapter establishes use of the genre “apocalypse,” and how each suggests a divergence from the typical worldview. The climactic conclusion of the chapter makes the case in a more obvious way, but first we will consider a more basic implication of the shape of the chapter as a whole.

The first chapter of Jubilees is a complex compound of Exodus 24 and Deuteronomy 31. The narrative setting comes from Exodus 24, particularly Jubilees 1:1-4 from Exodus 24:12-18.<sup>2</sup>

[JCVK] 1:1 During the first year of the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt, in the third month—on the sixteenth of the month—the Lord said to Moses: “Come up to me on the mountain. I will give you the two stone tablets of the law and the commandments which I have written so that you may teach them.” 1:2 So Moses went up the mountain of the Lord. The glory of the Lord took up residence on Mt. Sinai, and a cloud covered it for six days. 1:3 When he summoned Moses into the cloud on the seventh day, he saw the glory of the Lord like a fire blazing on the summit of the mountain. 1:4 Moses remained on the mountain for 40 days and 40 nights ... (Jubilees 1:1-4)

---

<sup>2</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 24-25. See further VanderKam, “Scriptural Setting,” 61-64.

[NJPS] The LORD said to Moses, “Come up to Me on the mountain and wait there, and I will give you the stone tablets with the teachings and commandments which I have inscribed to instruct them.” ... 24:15 When Moses had ascended the mountain, the cloud covered the mountain. 24:16 The Presence of the LORD abode on Mount Sinai, and the cloud hid it for six days. On the seventh day He called to Moses from the midst of the cloud. 24:17 Now the Presence of the LORD appeared in the sight of the Israelites as a consuming fire on the top of the mountain. 24:18 Moses went inside the cloud and ascended the mountain; and Moses remained on the mountain forty days and forty nights. (Exodus 24:12-18)

The chapter as a whole, however, owes more to Deuteronomy 31, particularly for the idea of prediction of apostasy. Parentheses indicate parallel phrases in Jubilees 1.

[NJPS] 31:16 The LORD said to Moses: You are soon to lie with your fathers. This people will thereupon go astray after the alien gods in their midst (1:8), in the land that they are about to enter; they will forsake Me and break My covenant that I made with them (1:5, 12). 31:17 Then My anger will flare up against them, and I will abandon them and hide My countenance from them (1:13). They shall be ready prey; and many evils and troubles shall befall them (1:6). And they shall say on that day, “Surely it is because our God is not in our midst that these evils have befallen us.” 31:18 Yet I will keep My countenance hidden on that day, because of all the evil they have done in turning to other gods (1:13). 31:19 Therefore, write down this poem and teach it to the people of Israel (1:5, 7, 26); put it in their mouths, in order that this poem may be My witness against the people of Israel (1:8). 31:20 When I bring them into the land flowing with milk and honey that I promised on oath to their fathers, and they eat their fill and grow fat and turn to other gods and serve them, spurning Me and breaking My covenant, (1:7-8) 31:21 and the many evils and troubles befall them—then this poem shall confront them as a witness (1:8), since it will never be lost from the mouth of their offspring. For I know what plans they are devising even now, before I bring them into the land that I promised on oath (1:7). (Deuteronomy 31:16-21)

[JCVK] 1:5 He said to him: “Pay attention to all the words which I tell you on this mountain. Write (them) in a book so that their offspring may see that I have not abandoned them because of all the evil they have done in straying from the covenant between me and you which I am making today on Mt. Sinai for their offspring. 1:6 So it will be that when all of these things befall them they will recognize that I have been more faithful than they in all their judgments and in all their actions. They will recognize that I have indeed been with them. 1:7 “Now you write this entire message which I am telling you today, because I know their defiance and their stubbornness (even) before I bring them into the land

which I promised by oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: ‘To your posterity I will give the land which flows with milk and honey’. When they eat and are full, 1:8 they will turn to foreign gods—to ones which will not save them from any of their afflictions. Then this testimony will serve as evidence. 1:9 For they will forget all my commandments—everything that I command them—and will follow the nations, their impurities, and their shame. They will serve their gods, and (this) will prove an obstacle for them—an affliction, a pain, and a trap.... 1:13 Then I will hide my face from them. I will deliver them into the control of the nations for captivity, for booty, and for being devoured. (Jubilees 1:5-9, 13)

The parallels continue in the prediction of repentance and restoration.

Thus far, there is nothing surprising in that Jubilees combines a passage from Exodus and a passage from Deuteronomy into a synthetic narrative. What is striking, for the present purposes, is that the mere combination, before we come to the interpretive additions and the particularly apocalypse-like conclusion of the chapter, already begins to take a form that could be recognized as an apocalypse in the 150s BCE. Neither Exodus 24 nor Deuteronomy 31 could be called an apocalypse by itself. Exodus 24 narrates a revelatory framework. One might find traces of a spatial axis in the stages of ascent on the mountain, but not the contents of the revelation. Likewise, the content of the revelation does not concern the temporal axis. Deuteronomy 31, on the other hand, has no more of a revelatory framework than “The Lord said to Moses” (31:16). Deuteronomy 31 does bring, however, a “prediction” of history with an interpretation of its meaning, in the direction of the more specific predictions typical of the apocalypses. One could also look to the content of the revelation for a hint of the spatial axis.

יִזְבְּחוּ לַשְּׂדִים לֹא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים לֹא יָדְעוּם

[NJPS] They sacrificed to demons which were no gods, to gods they had never known... (Deuteronomy 32:17)

[JCVK] They will sacrifice their children to demons and to every product (conceived by) their erring minds. (Jubilees 1:11)

I do not mean to suggest that any combination of Exodus 24 and Deuteronomy 31 necessarily constitutes an apocalypse. Even if it did it would be better explained as a coincidence or by-product than intentional use of genre. Since it is the case, however, that Jubilees adds elements that more clearly exercise the genre “apocalypse,” it is worth noting that even the basic selection of source material serves the construction of an apocalypse. Before turning to those additional elements, it is also worth pointing out again the fact discussed in Chapter 4. The construction of an apocalypse to such an extent from recycled authoritative materials is unusual and suggests that the view of revealed authority in Jubilees is not the view typical of apocalypses.

A number of interpretations and variations in Jubilees 1:1-25 mold the received materials into the form of an apocalypse. The prescience of Deuteronomy becomes more specific prediction. A number of elements, such as “righteous plant” (1:16), the “worthless spirit / spirit of Belial” (1:20), and “angels and spirits” (1:25) might contribute to conveying use of the genre apocalypse, even if they are not the exclusive domain of the apocalypses. Jubilees uses the genre clearly in 1:26-29 and establishes the apocalyptic literary framework for the contents of the entire book. These verses suffice to cause the reader to expect Jubilees to be like other apocalypses, and begin to suggest the ironic subversion of those expectations.

**ወአንተ ፡ ጸሐፍ ፡ ለከ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ ነገረ ፡ ዘአነ ፡ አየድዐክ ፡ በዝንቱ ፡ ደብር ፡  
 ዘቀዳሚ ፡ ወዘደኃሪ ፡ ወዘይመጽእ ፡ ሀሎ ፡ በኩሉ ፡ ኩፋሌ ፡ መዋዕል ፡ ዘበሕግ ፡  
 ወዘበስምዕ ፡ ወበሰባዔሆሙ ፡ ለኢየሴልዎን ፡ እስከ ፡ ለዓለም ፡፡ እስከ ፡ ሶበ ፡  
 እወርድ ፡ ወአንድር ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡ በኩሉ ፡ ዓለመ ፡ ዓለም ፡፡ (cf. 4Q216 IV)**

“Now write down the entire account which I am making known to you on this mountain from beginning to end, how it is to be in every division of time—as it is in the law and the testimony—into its weeks for jubilees forever, until the time when I descend and dwell with them forever and ever.” (Jubilees 1:26)

ወይቤሎ ፡ ለመልአክ ፡ ገጽ ፡ ጸሐፍ (ጋጥጋጥ) ፡ ለሙሴ ፡ እምቀዳሚ ፡ ፍትረት ፡  
እስከ ፡ አመ ፡ ይትሐነጽ ፡ መቅደስየ ፡ በማእከሎሙ ፡ ለዓለመ ፡ ዓለማት  
(cf. 4Q216 IV)

Then he said to an angel of the presence, “Dictate to Moses from the beginning of creation until the time my sanctuary is built among them forever and ever.” (Jubilees 1:27)

ወያስተርኢ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለዐይነ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ወያኦምር ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ከመ ፡ አነ ፡  
እምላክ ፡ እስራኤል ፡ ወአብ ፡ ለኩሎሙ ፡ ደቂቀ ፡ ያዕቆብ ፡ ወንጉሥ ፡ በደብረ ፡  
ጽዮን ፡ ለዓለመ ፡ ዓለም ፡ ወትከውን ፡ ጽዮን ፡ ወኢየሩሳሌም ፡ ቅድስት ፡ ።  
(cf. 4Q216 IV)

The Lord will be revealed in the sight of all, and all will know that I am the ruler of Israel, father to all the descendents of Jacob, and king on Mount Zion for ever and ever. Then Zion and Jerusalem will be holy. (Jubilees 1:28)

ወነሥኦ ፡ መልአክ ፡ ገጽ ፡ ዘየሐውር ፡ ቅድመ ፡ ተዓይኒሆሙ ፡ ለእስራኤል ፡  
ጽላተ ፡ ዘኩፋሌ ፡ ዓመታት ፡ እምአመ ፡ ፍጥረተ ፡ ሕግ ፡ ወለስምዕ ፡ ለሰባዔሁ ፡  
፡ ለኢየቤልዎን ፡ በበ ፡ ዓመት ፡ በኩሉ ፡ ፕልቆሙ ፡ ወኢየቤልዎን ፡ እምዕለተ ፡  
፡ ፍጥረት ፡ ሐዳስ ፡ አመ ፡ ይትሐደስ ፡ ሰማያት ፡ ወምድር ፡ ወኩሉ ፡  
ፍጥረቶሙ ፡ በከመ ፡ ንይላቲሆሙ ፡ ለሰማይ ፡ ወበከመ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ፍጥረተ ፡  
ምድር ፡ እስከ ፡ አመ ፡ ይትፈጠር ፡ መቅደስ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ በኢየሩሳሌም ፡  
በደብረ ፡ ጽዮን ፡ ኩሉ<sup>3</sup> ፡ ብርሃናት ፡ ይትሔደሱ ፡ ለፈውስ ፡ ወለሰላም ፡  
ወለበረከት ፡ ለኩሎሙ ፡ ኅሩያነ ፡ እስራኤል ፡ ወከመ ፡ ይኩን ፡ ከማሁ ፡  
እምይእቲ ፡ ዕለት ፡ ወእስከ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ መዋዕለ ፡ ምድር ፡ ።

The angel of the presence—who was going in front of the Israelite camp—took the tablets of the divisions of the years from the time of the creation of the law and testimony—according to its weeks for jubilees, each year in its full number, and its jubilees—which was the time of new creation, when the heavens become new, along with the earth, and all their creatures—each earthly creature in accordance with its heavenly host—until the time when the sanctuary of the Lord will be made. In Jerusalem, on Mount Zion, all the luminaries will be renewed for healing, health, and blessing of all the chosen, Israel, so that it will remain so from then on, for all the days of the earth. (Jubilees 1:29)

The last verse is textually difficult, as discussed in 6.6.5, but major emendation is not necessary. Rather, the verse and the passage as a whole should be understood as

<sup>3</sup> Manuscripts 39, 42, 48 read ኩሉ, unlike VanderKam’s base manuscript, 25, which reads ወኩሉ.

operating at multiple levels, exploiting language typical of apocalypses with an atypical meaning. Thus, for example, the phrase translated above as “from beginning to end” probably originally read הראשנים והאחרנים (in the sense of “the complete contents of a book” nine times in Chronicles), which could also evoke a more apocalyptic sense of “first things and last things (of the cosmos).” Similarly, the phrase translated “how it is to be” could bear a sense of “what will come to pass.” To the extent that such language creates a reader expectation of a detailed chronology of events after Moses and the end of history, the expectation is soon subverted. They are not the topic of the book as a whole and even chapter 23 does not provide these things precisely. The last verse plays on the apocalyptic sense of a “new creation” in the future, but uses the language to describe the original creation, the first time things were made new in Genesis 1. Similarly, the description of the construction of the sanctuary and the indwelling of God sounds like an apocalyptic description of a future restoration, especially in the last verse, but refers primarily to the sanctuary that was created in the very near future, relative to Moses, and the distant past, relative to the second century author (see further appendix 6.6.6). This passage sounds like an apocalypse particularly with respect to the temporal axis, but subverts the basic apocalyptic tendency to imagine an idealized future unlike the past. The idealized time is in the actual author’s past and needs only be brought back from hiatus.

The textual problems suggest that pre-modern transmitters had difficulty understanding the irony of the passage, and the emendations and translations of Charles and VanderKam guide the modern reader to see the passage as apocalyptic in both literary genre and worldview. Once the atypical meaning is sifted out from the typically apocalyptic language, the discord between literary genre and worldview can hardly be



explained as an accident. Already it is possible to imagine the author subverting the expectation of a radically new creation with a new theophany, revelation, temple, priesthood, and so forth. Jubilees seems to be arguing that Israel should look for these things in the past and examine its own covenantal fidelity to explain the present degradation.

This passage also meets the other criteria of the genre “apocalypse,” although the subversion begins subtly here and develops in what follows. The angel of the presence introduces the spatial axis, which will be developed more later. The tablets, soon identified as the “heavenly tablets” may also draw from the genre. A subtle hint of the subversion of angelic agency does appear here already in that the angel only dictates at the direct command of God what is already written. The angel does not guide or interpret for the human recipient of revelation—the angel does not take initiative or act independently in any way. The passage also establishes the apocalyptic revelatory framework of the book as a whole. The savvy reader will already find the irony in the use of the apocalyptic revelatory framework, since the contents of the revelation are identified as the publicly received scriptures from Genesis 1 through Exodus 24, namely, the creation up until the construction of the sanctuary. The passage introduces familiar common knowledge in a way that makes it sound like new esoteric revelation, i.e., an apocalypse.

## 7.2. Jubilees 2, creation

As the content of the revelation begins to unfold in Jubilees 2 the essential elements of the genre apocalypse continue to appear and continue to develop in atypical

ways. The revelation proceeds as a retelling of familiar revelation. The ranks of angels appear as part of God's good creation (2:2). More strikingly, the election of Israel appears as part of the original plan of creation (2:19).

[JCVK] 2:19 He said to us: 'I will now separate a people for myself from among my nations. They, too, will keep sabbath. I will sanctify the people for myself and will bless them as I sanctified the sabbath day. I will sanctify them for myself; in this way I will bless them. They will become my people and I will become their God. 2:20 I have chosen the descendants of Jacob among all of those whom I have seen. I have recorded them as my first-born son and have sanctified them for myself throughout the ages of eternity. I will tell them about the sabbath days so that they may keep sabbath from all work on them'. (Jubilees 2:19-20)

As discussed in Chapter 5, apocalypses often classify not only non-human beings, but groups within humanity. Jubilees stands out from the apocalypses in drawing a clear boundary between Israel and the rest of humanity, rejecting both the possibility of finding anything good among other nations, and the possibility of extending the process of election to a sub-group within Israel. As discussed in Chapter 6, Jubilees 2 presents the division of the nations as the original plan of creation, not the degradation of history in a corrupted world.

### 7.3. Jubilees 3-6, evil, injustice, and the lack thereof

Even outside the apocalypses, interpretation of the primordial history is a prime opportunity to reflect on the nature of evil and unjust suffering. Especially in the apocalypses, evil becomes an independent entity, sometimes a force in the cosmos at enmity with God, and constantly seeking to destroy goodness and pervert justice.

Jubilees, however, almost sounds like Pangloss in denying any robust force of evil in the

early history. Jubilees is certainly concerned with uncleanness and wickedness, but we must distinguish between human sin and Evil with a capital “E.” Furthermore, even before the Noah story, Jubilees suggests that sin is primarily associated with other nations, whereas Israel has an easy escape. Last, but not least, Jubilees essentially denies injustice, asserting that sin (let alone Evil) never escapes quick and precise justice.<sup>4</sup>

First, Jubilees retells Genesis 3 without any expansions on an etiology of evil. One shift is to assert that they had lived in the garden for seven years without sinning (3:15), which differs at least subtly from the view that sin was inevitable and immediate. The issue of longevity is developed in Jubilees 23, but the subtraction of seventy years from Adam’s thousand-year lifespan fits within a worldview of sin and punishment, not evil and corruption. The story of Cain is retold without the personification of sin, לַפְתָּח חֲטָאת רֹבֵץ וְאֵלֶיךָ תִּשְׁוָקֶתוּ וְאַתָּה תִּמְשָׁל-בּוֹ “sin crouches at the door craving to get you, but you can control it” (Genesis 4:7). The bigger shift in the Cain story, for our purposes, is the assertion that Cain received direct and fitting punishment from God.

---

<sup>4</sup> Michael Segal correctly shows that Jubilees rejects the explanation of suffering in the Book of the Watchers (Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 138-140.), but comes to different conclusions about the explanation of suffering Jubilees proposes. Segal asserts that there are three possible explanations of suffering: the explanation associated with the watchers, the explanation associated with Eden, and the created dualism associated with the Instruction on Two Spirits (6, 263). It is safe to say Jubilees does not endorse the first two (although I question whether Eden is necessarily an etiology of Evil in the philosophical sense of unjust suffering). The position in Jubilees may share certain advantages of the solution proposed later in the Instruction on Two Spirits, such as placing God in complete control for all time. However, only with later categories and dichotomies could one claim that in Jubilees, “evil was created from the beginning of the world as part of a dualistic system of good and evil, in heaven and on earth” (323, similarly 185-187, 241, 259). Incidentally, the overt claim that God created evil is hardly ubiquitous at Qumran—the Instruction on Two Spirits is preserved fully in only one manuscript and partially in a fragment (1 QS III.13—IV.26; 4QS<sup>c</sup> fragment 2). It is dubious whether Segal’s three categories apply to the time of Jubilees, but it is certain that the list is not exhaustive. At least a fourth possible explanation must be admitted. If we are to speak of Evil in the philosophical sense of unjust suffering (theodicy) rather than bad things happening as just consequences of sin, then Jubilees denies the existence of Evil, “there is no injustice” (Jubilees 5:13; *contra* Segal 97). Similarly, Segal creates anachronistic and inaccurate categories in asserting that all monotheists believe that either God is limited or God is the source of evil (189, 263).

[JCVK] 4:31 At the conclusion of this jubilee Cain was killed one year after him. His house fell on him, and he died inside his house. He was killed by its stones for with a stone he had killed Abel and, by a just punishment, he was killed with a stone. 4:32 For this reason it has been ordained on the heavenly tablets: ‘By the instrument with which a man kills his fellow he is to be killed. As he wounded him so are they to do to him’. (Jubilees 4:31-32)

Evil does not thrive in opposition to God, even temporarily, and the law of the cosmos is unerringly enforced. As discussed in Chapter 6, the apocalypses tend to look to the future for justice to win out eventually after a period in which evil thrives unchecked. The strict justice applied to Cain is the first of many examples of justice applied without waiting for a designated day of judgment for the cosmos. This point is not necessarily *ridiculing* a particular text or motif of justice deferred until a day of cosmic judgment, but does illustrate a fundamental difference in worldview on the nature of evil and how justice is placed on the temporal axis.

In the case of the watchers who sinned, the contrast with the particular traditions of the Book of the Watchers is a bit more pointed, although not a simple matter of denying the basic interpretation of Genesis 6 from the tradition. As discussed in Chapter 5, a number of changes to the watchers tradition transforms the story from an etiology of evil to an example of sin and punishment. Among these: the watchers have a good mission from God and commit the sin of intermarriage, not conspiracy against God; although demons find a function in the divine plan for other nations, this sin does not have lasting effects or explain the origin of evil (indeed, the new and righteous nature has already been given). Relatively speaking, Jubilees is unconcerned with the sin of the

watchers, other than to use it as an opportunity to assert complete, fulfilled, uncompromised justice,<sup>5</sup>

[JCVK] 5:11 He obliterated all from their places; there remained no one of them whom he did not judge for all their wickedness. 5:12 He made a new and righteous nature (literally: creation) for all his creatures so that they would not sin with their whole nature until eternity. Everyone will be righteous—each according to his kind—for all time. 5:13 The judgment of them all has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets; there is no injustice. (As for) all who transgress from their way in which it was ordained for them to go—if they do not go in it, judgment has been written down for each creature and for each kind. 5:14 There is nothing which is in heaven or on the earth, in the light, the darkness, Sheol, the deep, or in the dark place—all their judgments have been ordained, written, and inscribed. (Jubilees 5:11-14)

The assertion of justice goes on for two more verses before again anticipating the special status of Israel for purposes of mercy and forgiveness. When we come to Noah and his sons we will find that Jubilees does find a place for apocalyptic ideas of inherent wickedness, demons, and merciless judgment, but only with respect to other nations. For Israel, the apocalyptic worldview is the opposite of the truth.

The subversion of the function of the watchers tradition would not likely have been lost on the ancient reader. Jubilees uses the particular motifs and language typical of the Enochic apocalypses, forcing a comparison. A reasonably savvy ancient reader would easily notice the difference between using the watchers as an etiology of evil that explains present suffering, and confining them to a story about the past that illustrates God's perfect justice. Jubilees uses them as examples of sinners punished, but not even as

---

<sup>5</sup> See chapter 6, "The judgment discourse in Jubilees 5," for a discussion of whether Jubilees 5:10 should be understood as following the Book of the Watchers in the idea that the final judgment of the watchers is deferred for a future time (as suggested by VanderKam's translation), or implies that the judgment was fulfilled in the past, relative to Moses. It seems the flood was a great day of judgment itself and the matter is now resolved. The emphasis of the passage is the perfection of judgment.

the prime example (Sodom claims this distinction). I do not suggest that Jubilees ridiculed the Book of the Watchers as a text, or anticipated a concept of canon from which it should be excluded. It just so happens that the simple sense implication of the Book of the Watchers is a certain worldview, and Jubilees rejects the worldview. At this level, the Danielic apocalypses are no less relevant. Jubilees scoffs at the ideas that evil exists outside the choices that humans make for themselves, and that justice is ever seriously challenged or suspended. It is difficult to judge whether an ancient reader might have found humor in the subversion of the watcher story. It is easy to surmise, however, that the author intentionally incorporated the themes of judgment and the nature of evil from the apocalypses, and the particular motifs of the Enochic apocalypses, in order to create a direct comparison between worldviews. Since Jubilees rejects the foundational worldview, the adoption of superficial literary features is not likely to have been a serious attempt at harmonization. There is an ironic discord between the expectations raised by the use of genre and the ideas conveyed.

#### 7.4. Jubilees 10, the other nations

Jubilees has more to say about wickedness after the flood than before. As argued in Chapter 5, Jubilees ties the idea of irrecoverable wickedness not to angels or primordial origins, but to foreign nations. Consequently, Jubilees addresses the watchers, the giants, and the demons not in the natural place in the narrative sequence before the flood, but as part of the division of nations among Noah's sons. Jubilees includes demons and divine abandonment in its view of the world, but not as an explanation of suffering

and injustice against the chosen. These features of the apocalypses are transformed into afflictions of gentiles, and a warning to Israel to stay away from their cursed existence.

Jubilees consistently maintains emphasis on human choice as the origin of wickedness and asserts that all non-human beings obey God's will perfectly. However, God's will does have room for demons to afflict the nations whom God hates. In chapter 10, Jubilees draws from the genre "apocalypse" again to deal with demons and their angelic leader, but in comparison with the apocalypses they are atypical to say the least. Although Jubilees does not hesitate to look forward to the election of Jacob, Noah at least represents the chosen line, though not the chosen people. Consequently, Jubilees does not address the demons until it can address the nations, which begins with Noah's grandchildren. Although Jubilees adopts the derivation of the demons from the bastard giants, they do not appear in the narrative until Noah's grandsons become nations, first in 7:27 and fully in chapter 10,

[JCVK] During the third week of this jubilee impure demons began to mislead Noah's grandchildren, to make them act foolishly, and to destroy them. (Jubilees 10:1)

The striking part is how easily these demons are defeated by the righteous. Noah eliminates all of them simply by asking.

[JCVK] Then our God told us to tie up each one. (Jubilees 10:7)

Mastema makes a counter-intercession to restore ten percent of them, but with the clear function of punishing the wicked, not afflicting or testing the righteous.

እስመ : እመንቱ : ውእቶሙ : ለእማስኖ : ውለእስሕቶ : ቅድመ : ኩነኔየ :  
እስመ : ዐቢይ : እከዩሙ : ለውሉደ : ሰብእ ::

For they are meant for destroying and misleading before my judgment (or: authority<sup>6</sup>) because the wickedness of humankind is great.  
(Jubilees 10:8)

God then allows Mastema to use ten percent of the demons. Jubilees is the only ancient text to describe a diminishment of demons. Jubilees is not a compromise position and the emphasis is not a matter of half-empty or half-full. In other apocalypses demons are 100% active and relevant, but in Jubilees they are 10% active and relevant, and that 10% is limited to the punishment of wicked nations. For those who obey the books of Noah, later identified as the books preserved by the Levites for Israel “until this day,” the demons have no power.

[JCVK] 10:13 Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine, and the evil spirits were precluded from pursuing Noah’s children. 10:14 He gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons. (Jubilees 10:13-14)

The demons and the idolatry they inspire are reduced to impotence against the righteous, which soon equals Israel. Demons are utilized as an explanation of whatever power is perceived in foreign magic, but absolutely not an explanation of why the righteous suffer.

Mastema first appears in this passage. Mastema is a good example of ironic inversion of an element typically associated with the apocalypses. Mastema superficially resembles a figure from an apocalypse, but is denied any similar function. The name sounds like Satan but is not. Mastema evokes the role of a leader of evil forces in rebellion against God, but remains in constant submission to God. Mastema explains some trouble that the righteous face, but never claims any victory, only shame. As discussed in Chapter 5, Mastema is a complex figure. Jubilees likes the idea of a figure

---

<sup>6</sup> For this understanding of the verse see chapter 5, note 57.



that can proxy for the unbecoming deeds attributed to God in Exodus. There is also a complication in the extent to which “Satan” is relevant here as a particularly apocalyptic idea by the time of Jubilees. It may not be the case that portraying Mastema as a bungling variation on Satan ridicules any one apocalypse, but it does subvert a worldview in which God’s covenantal relationship with God’s people is successfully impeded by independent forces in the cosmos.

#### 7.5. Jubilees 15, heavenly outsourcing

Jubilees 11-14 includes several smaller features that resemble the apocalypses on the literary level, but depart in worldview. For example, the reader is reminded of the revelatory framework and the angel of the presence continues to take on functions that imply no independent will (12:22-27); the kind of foreign wisdom associated with astronomy is dismissed (12:16-18, cf. 8:3); Mastema continues to be easily defeated by the chosen line (11:11, 19-24); the language of “day of judgment” continues to refer to the non-deferred, non-eschatological judgment of individual persons and nations. The next new issue to evoke the apocalypses and refute the worldview appears in Jubilees 15.

The main issue of Jubilees 15 is circumcision, which is treated like a membership card that identifies those who have special status as God’s chosen. Rejection of circumcision constitutes rejection of the privileges of membership. The upper angels of holiness and presence are mentioned as being circumcised, but the effect is not so much to make Israel closer to the angels, but to place Israel in parallel with the angels as having direct access to God. Unlike other nations, God never outsources sovereignty over Israel to any heavenly intermediary.

[JCVK] 15:27 For this is what the nature of all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation. In front of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels. 15:28 Now you command the Israelites to keep the sign of this covenant throughout their history as an eternal ordinance so that they may not be uprooted from the earth 15:29 because the command has been ordained as a covenant so that they should keep it forever on all the Israelites. 15:30 For the Lord did not draw near to himself either Ishmael, his sons, his brothers, or Esau. He did not choose them (simply) because they were among Abraham's children, for he knew them. But he chose Israel to be his people. 15:31 He sanctified them and gathered (them) from all mankind. For there are many nations and many peoples and all belong to him. He made spirits rule over all in order to lead them astray from following him. 15:32 But over Israel he made no angel or spirit rule because he alone is their ruler. He will guard them and require them for himself from his angels, his spirits, and everyone, and all his powers so that he may guard them and bless them and so that they may be his and he theirs from now and forever.  
(Jubilees 15:27-32)

The issue is not whether other nations have angelic princes; Jubilees agrees with the apocalypses that they do, although there is a twist in that the angels are there to lead them astray, not to help them. The issue is whether Israel has one or more angels who mediate God's sovereignty. The problem is not only when the angels placed over Israel are bad, as in the Animal Apocalypse, but also when good angels introduce some inefficiency or temporary bureaucracy holding up God's benevolent will. The implication in the apocalypses seems to have been that the present time cannot be reconciled with the perfect justice expected from God, so there must be some other agents involved that both explain the inefficacy of justice in the present and ensure that God will soon retake the helm and intervene radically. Jubilees 15:32 makes clear that the unnamed angel of the presence in Jubilees is not comparable even to the good angels in the apocalypses who exercise some independent will. This is borne out by the rest of the book, since the angel of the presence appears often but only following the direct command of God.

Jubilees develops a discussion about circumcision into a discussion about the status and agency of angels. Jubilees sounds like an apocalypse in treating these issues, but departs from the typical view of angelic significance as independent agents and explanations of the suspension of divine blessing. This is a case of direct confrontation that is likely to have been intentional but unlikely to have been conciliatory.

#### 7.6. Jubilees 16-22, miscellanea

Although Jubilees 23 rightly attracts attention as the most central and sustained use of the genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees, it is not the case that use of the genre is limited to a few chapters. Indeed, not a chapter goes by in Jubilees 16-22 without some distinctive element typical of the apocalypses, sufficient to remind the reader of the basic framework already established. Most of these points are brief and reprise points already made earlier in the work, so they need not be reviewed exhaustively. Examples will be briefly listed to illustrate the point that partial use of the genre pervades Jubilees.

Jubilees 16 includes the judgment of Sodom, which replaces the watchers and giants as archetype of judgment.

[JCVK] The Lord will execute judgment in the same way in the places where people commit the same sort of impure actions as Sodom—just like the judgment of Sodom. (Jubilees 16:6)

The most significant implication, as discussed in Chapter 6, is that every nation has its own day of judgment in its own time—justice is not deferred until a single final day of judgment. The giants do appear one more time in parallel with Sodom as examples of judgment executed in 20:5, but in the rest of that chapter and the rest of the book the

giants are forgotten and Sodom fills the role. Jubilees subverts the apocalyptic view of judgment as temporally eschatological rather than individual and (essentially) immediate.

Jubilees 16 also invokes the heavenly tablets and angelic festival liturgy to eternalize the festivals as they came to be publicly practiced in Jerusalem (16:21, 28).

Jubilees 17-18 retells the binding of Isaac with the addition of Mastema. Borrowing a page from Job, Jubilees uses Mastema to explain a cruel test unbecoming a loving God. The obvious parallel with Job 1 is often noted, but a key variation should also be noted. In Job, the accuser is never put to shame; indeed the most shamed figure is Job, the “happy ending” notwithstanding. In Jubilees, “The prince of Mastema was put to shame” (18:12). This is not to deny that Mastema causes (or explains) difficulty for the chosen line, but it is significant that Mastema never claims any victory or poses a threat that is not easily and quickly overcome.

Abraham’s exhortation of Rebecca climaxes with a rather apocalypse-like description of eschatological renewal and heavenly agents,

[JCVK] May they [Jacob’s descendents] serve (the purpose of) laying heaven’s foundations, making the earth [or: land] firm, and renewing all the luminaries which are above the firmament. (Jubilees 19:25)

The more complicated issue discussed in Chapter 6 is whether this “eschatological” renewal is purely future, or on some level refers to the priestly cult as it existed beginning with Aaron. Indeed, it is both, but it is significant that, unlike in the apocalypses, the eschatological sequence restores the Jerusalem cult as it already existed. The more simple issue in Jubilees 19:25 is that the roles are basically reversed: cosmic entities depend on the earthly cult of Israel in Jerusalem, whereas apocalypses typically present earthly things as shadows of their heavenly counterparts.

Jubilees 21-22 deals with the election of Jacob. It seems plausible that the language of “righteous plant” (16:16; 21:24) evokes the apocalypses, even if it is not limited to apocalypses. At any rate, Jubilees certainly differs from the apocalypses in asserting that all the descendants of Jacob are chosen, not a narrower group within Israel. All Israel is the righteous plant.<sup>7</sup> We may at least imagine that certain apocalypses would have come to mind upon reading a prediction such as,

[JCVK] ...for he knew and ascertained that from him there would come a  
righteous plant for the history of eternity... (Jubilees 16:26)

In that case, the fact from context that “him” is Isaac and the “righteous plant” is all of Israel would invert the view of “righteous plants” in apocalypses. Jubilees “transplants” language associated with election of a group within Israel into a context that causes it to refer to the election of all of Israel.

Demons, another feature typical of but not limited to apocalypses, appear again in 22:17. Again, they are characteristic of other nations and a threat to Israel only if it forsakes its protection of separation.

#### 7.7. Jubilees 21, Enoch + Noah = Leviticus

One additional point of possible ironic use of genre in this section concerns the reference to the books of Enoch and Noah in 21:10. This point was not made in Chapter 4 because it is speculative and touches on some complicated issues of scholarly disagreement. The point may not convince one who is not otherwise convinced, but it

---

<sup>7</sup> The fact that the Levites are singled out for sanctification does not negate this basic point relative to the apocalypses (22:11).

will be mentioned here because it may, if one accepts the premise, represent a moment of direct subversion. The basic issue which was discussed in Chapter 4 is that Jubilees asserts a unity to all revelation in the heavenly tablets, and identifies that revelation with the publicly received scriptures of Israel. We must not think of Jubilees as opposed to Third Isaiah, the Book of the Watchers, or apocalypses in an absolute sense as if Jubilees had a concept of canon from which it sought to exclude such works. The question is more of which texts Jubilees embraces wholeheartedly, and which it interprets and stretches in such a way as to subvert the more naturally implied worldview. Basically, Jubilees embraces Genesis through Deuteronomy, and distorts the Book of the Watchers, Third Isaiah, and other texts to agree with the former.

The potential subversion in Jubilees 21:10 is the assertion that the words of Enoch and Noah equal the exact contents of Leviticus.

[JCVK] Eat its meat during that day and on the next day; but the sun is not to set on it on the next day until it is eaten. It is not to be left over for the third day because it is not acceptable to him. For it was not pleasing and is not therefore commanded. All who eat it will bring guilt on themselves because this is the way I found (it) written in the book of my ancestors, in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah. (Jubilees 21:10)

וכי תזבחון זבח שלמים ליהוה לרצונכם תזבחהו:  
 ביום זבחכם יאכל וממחרת והנותר עד-יום השלישי באש ישרף:  
 ואם האכל יאכל ביום השלישי פגול הוא לא ירצה:  
 ואכליו עונו ישא כי-את-קדש יהוה חלל ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מעמיה:

[NJPS] When you sacrifice an offering of well-being to the LORD, sacrifice it so that it may be accepted on your behalf. It shall be eaten on the day you sacrifice it, or on the day following; but what is left by the third day must be consumed in fire. If it should be eaten on the third day, it is an offensive thing, it will not be acceptable. And he who eats of it shall bear his guilt, for he has profaned what is sacred to the LORD; that person shall be cut off from his kin. (Leviticus 19:5-8)

Jubilees 21:8 established that the case is a peace offering. We must bracket for a moment the question of whether there existed a single authoritative Book of Noah that accounts for the various assertions of Noachic literature and scribal activity. It is properly accepted that Jubilees was original in the assertion that the exact ordinances of Sinai were known and followed previously. If we assume that the Enochic and Noachic literature known to us is at least roughly representative of that known to the author and audience of Jubilees, then it may be subversive to assert that the content of Enochic and Noachic literature is identical to the cultic regulations of Leviticus. (This would not be the case if the regulations were simply about blood.) It is one thing for Jubilees to claim generally a unity of revelation, such that the covenant laws are eternal not only going forward from Sinai, but also backwards to creation. Here we have a very specific assertion making a direct comparison. It seems likely to me that the assertion would have been discordant to one familiar with that literature, and perhaps offensive to one who thought that Enoch or Noah bore an authority of holiness and righteousness independent of the priestly cult in Jerusalem. This instance cannot be an example of harmonization between Mosaic and Enochic literature, or between groups more persuaded by one authority or the other. Jubilees simply pushes the contents of Leviticus into the mouths of Enoch and Noah and asserts that the only legitimate revelation is perfectly harmonious with itself.

#### 7.8. Jubilees 23

Jubilees 23 is central in the Book of Jubilees in several ways. If modern versification may be used as an approximate measure of length, the middle verse of the book is Jubilees 23:23. It has been recognized that Jacob is a central figure in Jubilees,

and Jubilees 23 makes the narrative transition from Jacob's ancestry to Jacob himself. More importantly for the present purposes, Jubilees 23 is the central pillar of the literary framework and use of the genre "apocalypse." Elements associated with the apocalypses pervade the book, particularly on matters of the spatial axis. The beginning, middle and end of Jubilees, however, concentrate use of the distinctive elements from the temporal axis. There is room to disagree about other chapters and the extent to which the apocalyptic literary framework colors smaller literary elements that might not be identified as apocalyptic by themselves. There is no doubt, however, that Jubilees 23 uses the literary genre of the historical apocalypses and evokes reader associations with other apocalypses and the ideas typically conveyed thereby.

Before commenting on specific verses for the use of the literary genre and subversion of the worldview, two over-arching points should be noted. The first, briefer, point is simply to note some things that are conspicuously missing in the chapter. There is no angelic agency. The cycle of sin, punishment, repentance and restoration is exclusively between God and Israel. Accusers (satans) and wicked ones are mentioned only as being absent. The end of the chapter reminds the reader of the revelatory framework which includes an angel, but the so-called Jubilees "apocalypse" stands out from the rest of the book for avoiding discussion of cosmic agents. In the context of the book, the suspension of a certain literary element conveys meaning just as surely as the use of literary elements discussed next. Another striking absence in Jubilees 23 compared to the rest of the book pertaining to the genre "apocalypse" is the complete lack of chronological framework for the "eschatological" sequence. This is not a simple argument from silence because it stands in immediate contrast to the chronological framework used to describe the time of creation (earth to original sanctuary). The striking



implication is that the sin and repentance described in Jubilees 23 is not appointed or predestined in a specific chronological sense, as in the typical apocalypses. Jubilees 23 expands on Deuteronomy in *predicting* sin, punishment, repentance and restoration, but conspicuously avoids a chronological *predestination* that diminishes the significance of human choice.

The second over-arching point is that Jubilees takes elements from the apocalyptic structure of history, and forces the elements to conform to the Deuteronomistic structure of history. That is, we see forms of decline of history, final woes, reversal, judgment and restoration, but they are made to conform to a structure of sin, punishment, repentance and restoration. George Nickelsburg rightly reiterates this striking observation in his discussions of Jubilees.<sup>8</sup> I propose that this fact can be explained as part of Jubilees' ironic use of the genre "apocalypse." Scholars must be wary of anachronistic constructs and perceived clashes between views of history that only in the modern period are labeled Deuteronomistic and apocalyptic. In this case, however, there is at least one good parallel for the juxtaposition of the Torah of Moses and apocalyptic revelation as mutually exclusive explanations of suffering and proposed responses. Daniel 9 is essentially the opposite of Jubilees 23 in presenting one worldview and showing it not to be the correct explanation and proposal for the present circumstances. It is a slightly different matter how we should characterize the tone of Daniel 9, but any explanation of Daniel 9 other than sloppy and oblivious redaction

---

<sup>8</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, 73 (1981 78. Nickelsburg, "The Nature and Function of Revelation," 104. See further, L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents*, JSJSup 49 (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1996), 241 n. 2.

supports the present point that the explanation of suffering typical of the apocalypses is in tension with the explanation associated with the “Torah of Moses,” which we might call the Deuteronomistic model. Daniel 9 is the best case, but Randall Argall’s comparison between Sirach and 1 Enoch supports the case for rivalry between competing explanations of suffering.<sup>9</sup>

Although Jubilees 23 clearly evokes the apocalypses, the worldview is uncompromisingly Deuteronomistic. Israel sins, God punishes, Israel repents, God restores. Suffering is explained as chastisement, and the proposed response is to repent. This is not compatible with the apocalyptic explanation of suffering as a temporary suspension of benevolent divine sovereignty that tests endurance until an appointed time. The fundamental ironic inversion in Jubilees 23 is the use of the literary genre of the apocalypses to present a view of history and suffering incompatible with the view typically conveyed by means of the genre. The nuances and details in the chapter will allow us to identify the probability of intent in some subversive use of imagery. For the sake of completeness the following gives all of Jubilees 23:8-32 with comments on irony. The preceding context is the death, burial, and mourning of Abraham. The translation follows VanderKam with alternate senses in the comments.

**23:8 He had lived for three jubilees and four weeks of years—175 years—when he completed his lifetime. He had grown old and (his) time was completed. 23:9 For the times of the ancients were 19 jubilees for their lifetimes. After the flood they started to decrease from 19 jubilees, to be fewer with respect to jubilees, to age quickly, and to have their times be completed in view of the numerous difficulties and through the wickedness of their ways—with the exception of Abraham. 23:10 For Abraham was perfect with the Lord in everything that he did—being properly pleasing throughout all his**

---

<sup>9</sup> Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*.

**lifetime. And yet (even) he had not completed four jubilees during his lifetime when he became old—in view of wickedness—and reached the end of his time.**

Scholars who have attempted to explain the apocalypse-like elements in Jubilees as an insertion or redaction from a separate source have had trouble deciding where the apocalypse begins. Jubilees 23 starts slowly, but in these three verses already picks up some elements from the apocalypses. The issue of longevity takes the form of an apocalyptic decline of history, with the variation that the decline is gradual and in no way implies a crisis in the present moment. More generally, these verses introduce the subject of explanation of suffering, which is hardly exclusive to the apocalypses but fits a pattern of association.

**23:11 All the generations that will come into being from now until the great day of judgment will grow old quickly—before they complete two jubilees. It will be their knowledge that will leave them because of their old age; all of their knowledge will depart.**

This verse introduces the historical “prediction” and the particular temporal point called the “great day of judgment.” The point, however, is shown not to be an end of history, but a turning point. Most significantly, the great day of judgment comes to be portrayed as a *past* event, relative to the time of composition. Another nuance may be at work here. As discussed in Chapter 4, the term “wisdom” is avoided. “Knowledge” may be comparable, but the comparison brings with it some irony. Knowledge, wisdom or enlightenment arises in a certain group in several apocalypses. Jubilees does not single out a group here for lacking knowledge, but it is striking that knowledge/wisdom/enlightenment appears in the chapter only as being absent. The restoration involves repentance to the old laws, not some new gnosis or mystery.

**23:12 At that time, if a man lives a jubilee and one-half of years, it will be said about him: ‘He has lived for a long time’. But the greater part**

**of his time will be (characterized by) difficulties, toil, and distress without peace 23:13 because (there will be) blow upon blow, wound upon wound, distress upon distress, bad news upon bad news, disease upon disease, and every (kind of) bad punishment like this, one with the other: disease and stomach pains; snow, hail, and frost; fever, cold, and numbness; famine, death, sword, captivity, and every (sort of) blow and difficulty. 23:14 All of this will happen to the evil generation which makes the earth commit sin through sexual impurity, contamination, and their detestable actions. 23:15 Then it will be said: ‘The days of the ancients were numerous—as many as 1000 years—and good. But now the days of our lives, if a man has lived for a long time, are 70 years, and, if he is strong, 80 years’. All are evil and there is no peace during the days of that evil generation.**

Chapter 4 addressed the use of received scriptures in Jubilees 23 even as it departs from the base narrative of Genesis-Exodus. The point is subtle, as apocalypses also make use of traditional materials, but the materials are used differently. Jubilees implies a unity and sufficiency to received scriptures (as opposed to new revelation) in the persistence with which it packs scripture with more scripture.

These verses introduce the “final woes” that develop more specifically in 23:16-25. Jubilees includes the generic categories of “famine, death, sword and captivity.” One would not want to say these categories are not woeful, but the twist is in the elaboration of the categories. Typically, an apocalypse is both graphic and absolute, whereas Jubilees 23 elaborates the categories with relatively quotidian woes. In particular, natural and quotidian problems such as stomach-ache, snow, hail, frost, fever, cold, numbness, and mortality at the age of seventy or eighty years invert the implication of final woes. Not only are the woes “normal” and un-woeful relative to the apocalypses, which are evoked by the literary genre, they are un-woeful relative to the covenant curses of Deuteronomy 28, which are evoked by language and theme. A reader expects graphic elaboration of unimaginable woes, but basically learns that life as we know it is punishment relative to God’s plan. The final woes typically imply a crisis of history, an

unraveling of nature from normal to far worse than normal. In Jubilees, normal life is the nadir of history, and is woeful only relative to an imagined ideal of utopian blessing. We will come to some exceptions that have their own subversive twist, but basically Jubilees 23 takes the crisis out of the apocalyptic crisis of history by making the decline, nadir, and restoration imperceptibly gradual and normal. Furthermore, it is easy to find irony in the variation on the genre with radical demotion of significance, replacing unimaginable horrors with stomach-aches and frost.

**23:16 During that generation the children will find fault with their fathers and elders because of sin and injustice, because of what they say and the great evils that they commit, and because of their abandoning the covenant which the Lord had made between them and himself so that they should observe and perform all his commands, ordinances, and all his laws without deviating to the left or right. 23:17 For all have acted wickedly; every mouth speaks what is sinful. Everything that they do is impure and something detestable; all their ways are (characterized by) contamination, and corruption.**

It is easy for a modern reader to project expectations of typical apocalyptic contents after the introduction, “During that generation the children will...” One expects the “children” to be praised and free of sin, as in the comparable passage in the Animal Apocalypse,

[GWEN] And look, lambs were born of those white sheep, and they began to open their eyes and to see and to cry out to the sheep. But they did not listen to them nor attend to their words, but they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded. (Animal Apocalypse 90:6-7)

Jubilees 23:16 is relatively ambiguous, but verse 17 is the first to suggest that “all” are at fault, confirmed later by the fact that each group commits the sin of bloodshed and God punishes all without vindicating any group. Assuming a savvy reader would have picked up on the irony by now, verse 16 begins to turn on the apocalypses even while remaining

ambiguous. After all, is it really so praiseworthy by itself for children to find fault with elders? An apocalypse such as the Animal Apocalypse praises the new movement of “the children” with a clear claim that youth were right and the elders wrong. Verse 16 evokes such an association, but one is soon caused to question, if one has not questioned already, whether “because of sin and injustice” is the sin and injustice of the elders or the accusers. After all, accusing elders could itself be a form of abandoning the covenant. Deuteronomy 21 calls on the elders to judge and kill the child that defies a parent, not to mention the Decalogue command to honor parents. Even if verse 16 is ambiguous enough to permit an assumption that the children are sinless and the elders are sinful, the subsequent verses overturn such an assumption.

As discussed in Chapter 5, I do not take “the children” as a technical term for a particular group, but it is the case that apocalypses sometimes use such language to describe the origin of a new and separate group outside established structures. I do not suggest that verse 16 is referring to a particular group or text, partially because several distinct groups likely fit under the classification of new movements around the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. I do think Jubilees is confronting attempts to portray the recent civil war as a pious revival revolting against corrupt, oppressive and evil leaders. Jubilees portrays the civil war itself as impious fratricide. The children in verse sixteen are contrasted with the children in verse twenty-six, showing that the proper action is repentance and study of the traditional laws, not accusations and bloodshed. Even if they were a particular group and the same particular group in both verses, the course of action in verse 16 is rejected. Others had used the genre “apocalypse” to claim pretension. The author of Jubilees seems to use it to call the pretension false.

**23:18 The earth will indeed be destroyed because of all that they do. There will be no produce from the vine and no oil because what they do (constitutes) complete disobedience. All will be destroyed together—animals, cattle, birds, and all fish of the sea—because of mankind.**

This verse plays between the apocalyptic language of final catastrophic destruction of the world as we know it, and the Deuteronomistic function of divine chastisement through famine and diminished ecological prosperity. Especially in the context of the other literary elements from apocalypses, the translation “the earth will be destroyed” is appropriately suggestive of the total ecological destruction found especially in the Book of the Watchers or the Epistle of Enoch. The twist, however, is that life goes on in the next verse un-obliterated. Especially if the audience would have understood this as the famine of 162 or 160 BCE, as discussed in Chapter 3, the sense is more that “the bounty of the earth will be diminished.” The difference between cosmic catastrophe in other apocalypses and the famine here is not just a matter of degree and finality, it is a matter of timing. The imagery evokes a final, future destruction, but is applied to a *past* event. It would be like evoking “A Hard Rain’s A-Gonna Fall” to say it rained yesterday. The event *sounds like* a flood of complete destruction, but functions more like famine in Deuteronomy or Hosea, where similar language lacks eschatological finality.

עַל־כֵּן | תֵּאָבֵל הָאָרֶץ  
וְאִמְלֵל כָּל־יוֹשֵׁב בָּהָּ  
בְּחַיֵּית הַשָּׂדֶה וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם  
וְגַם־דִּגְי הַיָּם יִאָּסְפוּ:

Thus the land dries up  
Everything that dwells on it languishes  
Everything among the beasts of the field and the birds of the sky  
Even the fish of the sea are withheld (Hosea 4:3)

Along similar lines, the agency here is not a cosmic conflict and purgation, but human sin and divine chastisement. Famine has theological significance in the Deuteronomistic

worldview, but the proposed response is to repent, not to panic and imagine that the sky is falling and the whole world is coming apart. Jubilees subverts apocalyptic imagery of cosmic catastrophe.

**23:19 One group will struggle with another—the young with the old, the old with the young; the poor with the rich, the lowly with the great; and the needy with the ruler—regarding the law and the covenant. For they have forgotten commandment, covenant, festival, month, sabbath, jubilee, and every verdict. 23:20 They will stand up with swords and warfare in order to bring them back to the way; but they will not be brought back until much blood is shed on the earth by each group. 23:21 Those who escape will not turn from their wickedness to the right way because all of them will elevate themselves for (the purpose of) cheating and through wealth so that one takes everything that belongs to another. They will *mention* the great name but neither truly nor rightly. They will defile the holy of holies with the impure corruption of their contamination.**

If verse nineteen evokes the suggestion of a great struggle of good against evil, the persecuted breaking the bonds of persecution and establishing lasting justice, the suggestion is quickly subverted. Especially in Jubilees, there is nothing glorious about “shedding much blood on the earth,” and Jubilees’ harsh condemnation of all forms of fratricide should likewise be considered as part of the condemnation of the civil war. The generic associations make it easy to expect that Jubilees is praising one side in the war, but on closer examination there are no militant groups here or later that escape condemnation. Chapter 3 explored possible specific historical references in these verses. The point here is that Jubilees uses literary elements that evoke the portrayals of the civil war in the Animal Apocalypse and Daniel 11, but subverts the pretension of acting on behalf of God in the slaughter of other Jews. The subversion of expectations constitutes irony.

**23:22 There will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation. He will deliver them to the sword, judgment,**



**captivity, plundering, and devouring. 23:23 He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old or young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. They will cause chaos in Israel and sin against Jacob. Much blood will be shed on the earth, and there will be no one who gathers up (corpses) or who buries (them).**

Jubilees here takes a break from subtlety to make clear its evaluation of the civil war and the explanation of suffering typically associated with the apocalypses. The lesser point is that the whole generation (old and young, perhaps referring to the description of the two groups in 23:19) is punished, no side is vindicated. The greater point is that the foreign occupation is viewed as punishment for the civil war *from God*. Suffering is not the result of forces of evil in the cosmos rebelling against God, persecuting the righteous, and perverting justice. Justice is fully intact, and suffering comes from God as punishment for sin. The shared use of literary genre hardly constitutes a gesture toward reconciliation between the views of Antiochus Epiphanes and Bacchides as enemies of God or agents of God.

**23:24 At that time they will cry out and call and pray to be rescued from the power of the sinful nations, but there will be no one who rescues (them). 23:25 The children's heads will turn white with gray hair. A child who is three weeks of age will look old like one whose years are 100, and their condition will be destroyed through distress and pain.**

For the most part the present dissertation has been concerned with a more abstract discussion of literary genre, typical worldview, and literary irony, and less dependent on comparison of specific passages. The main argument does not argue or assume that the author of Jubilees knew specific apocalypses as we know them. Here, however, at the hyperbolic description of the nadir of history typical of the apocalypses, it is possible to identify some specific anti-parallels in imagery. First, we should consider Isaiah 65:20.

Even though Third Isaiah does not use the literary genre apocalypse, a conceptual relationship has long been recognized. The image of an infant who looks like an old man seems to derive from distorting the syntax of Isaiah 65:20.

לֹא־יְהִיָּה מִשָּׁם עוֹד עוֹל יָמִים וְזָקֵן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֹא אֶת־יָמָיו  
(Isaiah 65:20) כִּי הַנֶּעַר בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יָמוּת וְהַחוּטָא בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יִקְלָל:

Whereas modern translations rightly grasp the disjunction, rendering something to the effect of, “There will be neither an infant nor an old man who dies prematurely,” Jubilees presupposes a conjunction, “one who is both an infant and an old man.” The terminology is recognizable from Third Isaiah, but Jubilees rearranges the climax of restoration into a ridiculous image of a gnome. As discussed in Chapter 6, the hope of restoration in Jubilees is at odds with that imagined in Third Isaiah. It is possible that Jubilees not only asserts a differing viewpoint, but slips in some spoof imagery to illustrate how ridiculous the author thinks such an agenda really is (particularly in expecting a new people with a new name, new temple, new heaven and new earth).

These two verses also intersect in language with Daniel 11:34-35, and contradict in meaning. The Animal Apocalypse also intersects here. The two intersecting issues are white children and crying for help.

וּבְהַכְשֵׁלָם יַעֲזְרוּ עֲזָרָה מְעוֹט וְנָלוּ עֲלֵיהֶם רַבִּים בַּחֲלָלָקוֹת:  
וּמִן־הַמְּשֻׁכָּלִים יִפְשְׁלוּ לְצָרוֹף בָּהֶם וּלְבָרֵר וְלִלְבֵּן עַד־עֵת קֵץ כִּי־עוֹד לְמוֹעֵד:

When they fall they will receive a little help, but many will join them  
insincerely. Some of the enlightened will fall so as to be refined, purified,  
and whitened until the time of the end, for it is not yet the appointed time.  
(Daniel 11:34-35)

The basic issue is whether being white is a good thing or a bad thing. In Leviticus or Numbers a white head is a skin disease and a threat to purity (Leviticus 13; Numbers 12:10). In fact, the European association of whiteness with purity is mostly absent from

the Hebrew scriptures. Daniel 11 is one of the few cases where being made white and being made pure are in parallel (likewise Daniel 7:9). The Animal Apocalypse is another clear case where whiteness is a good thing (consider also the birth of Noah tradition preserved in 1 Enoch 106:2 and the Genesis Apocryphon). Combine this with the previously considered extent to which “the children” connoted reformist groups around the time of the civil war, and it becomes no neutral issue whether “white children” are glorified or despised. In Jubilees, the white children are the lowest of the low, the worst of all punishments. It is not important for the present point whether this image referred to a specific group, but it is clear enough that the image subverts the imagery that the authors of contemporary apocalypses found fit for self-glorification.

If only because it appears in the same context, we should also consider the implication of the different images of calling for help. In the Animal Apocalypse, Judah Maccabee brings about the eschatological victory not by winning the war himself, but crying out for help while engaged in a just struggle. The angel and God hear the cry and intercede (90:11-15). Daniel differs on whether the help received in battle marks the true resolution, but still seems at least vaguely comparable in language. If we are to imagine that the author or audience of Jubilees knew Daniel 11 or the Animal Apocalypse well enough to make an association, it is noteworthy that no help at all comes in Jubilees 23:24. Since Jubilees already identified the civil war as the sin that brought on the punishment from God, the idea that they would receive any help at all is out of the question. Again, Jubilees finds its position supported in Deuteronomy (28:29, 31), but uses literary elements from the apocalypses to illustrate the contradiction in specific application.

**23:26 In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way.**

After condemning the militant “children,” we finally come to the normative response of repentance and non-violent study. It is not impossible that the children here represent the same group having changed their ways, but in light of the following and the rest of the book, any suggestion of a separate group or sect is probably ironic. The point seems to be that Israel as a whole repents. As discussed above, the idea that Israel’s suffering can be resolved by repentance conflicts with the apocalyptic worldview, particularly as contrasted in Daniel 9.

**23:27 The days will begin to become numerous and increase, and mankind as well—generation by generation and day by day until their lifetimes approach 1000 years and to more years than the number of days (had been).**

Whereas the apocalyptic view of the temporal axis is characterized by radical reversal, Jubilees proposes a gradual, natural return to the original plan of creation. More importantly, the modest claims of restoration allow the claim that the “crisis” is already past and the restoration underway. Jubilees replaces the urgent anticipation of “the end is near” with “been there, done that.”

**23:28 There will be no old man, nor anyone who has lived out his lifetime, because all of them will be infants and children.**

Although the sentiment appears to be close to that of Isaiah 65:20, discussed above, perhaps only for subversion sake the verse is negated. In Isaiah there will not be one who has *failed* to live out one’s life, but in Jubilees there will not be one who *has* lived out one’s life. In Isaiah there will be *no* infant (implicitly infant mortality), but in Jubilees *all* will be infants.

**23:29 They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully. There will be neither a satan nor any evil one who will destroy. For their entire lifetimes will be times of blessing and healing.**

The context does not strictly require that “satans and evil ones” be non-human entities, but comparison with the key eschatological agents of the apocalypses is certainly warranted by the use of the genre. By alluding to such agents now, Jubilees points out the lack of mention in the just told eschatological scenario. Even when they do appear here, they are mentioned only as being absent. Whereas Jubilees plays with the idea of angels and demons elsewhere in the book, in the eschatological moment on the temporal axis, where such agents typically figure most prominently, Jubilees excludes them entirely. It is not the case that Jubilees simply forgot about the spatial axis when composing this little spoof on a historical apocalypse, and the argument is not merely from silence. Jubilees subverts an expectation of cosmic agents consummating a catastrophic conflict by describing a past eschatology devoid of angelic or demonic influence.

**23:30 Then the Lord will heal his servants. They will rise and see great peace. He will expel his enemies. The righteous will see (this), offer praise, and be very happy forever and ever. They will see all their punishments and curses on their enemies. 23:31 Their bones will rest in the earth and their spirits will be very happy. They will know that the Lord is one who executes judgment but shows kindness to hundreds and thousands and to all who love him.**

If not for the rest of the book, one might imagine that God’s servants refer only to a specific group within Israel, comparable to those who receive a new name in Isaiah 65:15. Even if it is implied that some were righteous and some were not, the overall emphasis in the book is on the unity of Israel, and the context here is not concerned with the vindication of a particular group or validation of a new priesthood. If “they will rise” connotes resurrection or exaltation of the dead, then the connotation is quickly subverted. The nation rises in peace and prosperity. The resolution is along the lines of “rest in

peace” or a “good death.” Dualism of body and spirit, even ironically, should not be projected here.

Relatively speaking, vindictiveness against foreign invaders is also pretty mild. The main punishment is being sent home, the restoration of separation between Israel and the nations. Curses are mentioned but not elaborated, requiring the reader to recall from earlier in the chapter that the curses are the curses of life as we know it. It seems that the nations, in their own lands, continue to experience mortality at the age of seventy or eighty, shovel snow, and get stomach aches, while Israel alone comes to its intended blessings. Whereas a historical apocalypse typically imagines a radical reversal and graphic vindication and vengeance, Jubilees imagines a gradual fulfillment of the original plan of creation. Notice also that God does the expelling—it is never the case that a sword is given to the righteous to kill anyone. Jubilees imagines an ideal restoration in its own terms, but the contrast with other imagined ideals is not only slightly different and not plausibly harmonistic. Jubilees expresses very different eschatological ideals, and the contrast is sharpened by literary evocation of the apocalypses.

**23:32 Now you, Moses, write down these words because this is how it is written and entered in the testimony of the heavenly tablets for the history of eternity.**

Last but not least, Jubilees reminds the reader of the narrative framework of revelation that ties all the apocalyptic literary elements into true use of the literary genre “apocalypse.” The definition of the genre is fully present, while the worldview separates this chapter and the rest of the book from the typical apocalypses.

## 7.9. Jubilees 24-46, more miscellanea

Three larger issues from the second half of Jubilees will be considered next. First, it should be noted again that it is not only in a few particular passages, but spread throughout the book, that Jubilees makes use of literary elements of the apocalypses and reminds the reader of the apocalyptic revelatory framework. The language of a “day of judgment” appears in connection with the nations the ancestors encounter, but the ironic twist is that each nation faces its own judgment, and judgment is not deferred until a universal judgment. As discussed in appendix 6.6.3, in some cases Jubilees may be explaining, not predicting, why certain nations have already ceased to exist. In the cases of the watchers, Sodom, and the Rafaim, it is clear that the judgment has already taken place.

[JCVK] They [the Rafaim] no longer have length of life on the earth.  
(Jubilees 29:11)

The heavenly tablets also continue to appear frequently as revelation of already familiar revelation. Angels continue to fill roles devoid of independent agency. Jubilees 35 references back to the idea in Jubilees 16 that other nations are ruled by angels while Israel is ruled by God directly,

[JCVK] ... Jacob’s guardian is greater and more powerful, glorious, and praiseworthy than Esau’s guardian. (Jubilees 35:17)

Mastema continues to be an impotent figure. Mastema explains the perceived power of Egyptian magic and unbecoming actions attributed to God in Exodus, but the fact that Mastema remains fully under God’s control becomes clear:

[JCVK] The Lord’s forces did everything that the Lord ordered them.  
(Jubilees 49:4)

The ironic twist is that “the Lord’s forces” were just identified as Mastema’s forces. Mastema has a function in Jubilees to do God’s dirty work, but does not threaten God’s benevolent justice and does not explain why the righteous suffer. Jubilees frequently evokes comparison with the apocalypses, and consistently inverts the basic worldview typically implied in the apocalypses. The pattern is too widespread to be accidental, and too one-sided to be a successful harmonization of worldviews.

#### 7.10. Jubilees 30-32, six reasons to love Levites

References to the election of Levi appear throughout Jubilees, but Jubilees 30-32 is a *tour de force* in favor of Levi.<sup>10</sup> In these chapters I count no less than six assertions or justifications of the election of Levi, most of which make some use of generic literary elements of apocalypses. The use of the genre to elevate Levi relates to all three of the body chapters of this dissertation. The first part of Chapter 4 considered the use of the genre to re-authorize already authoritative scriptures. Without pushing too far into social reconstruction, we can add that the authority of scriptures is inseparable from the authority of the bearers and teachers of scriptures, so the over-authorization of Levi is certainly relevant.

[JCVK] He gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi  
so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today.  
(Jubilees 45:16)

---

<sup>10</sup> For more on Levi in Jubilees 30-32 see James C. VanderKam, “Jubilees’ Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest,” in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup 62 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 545-561. James L. Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings,” *HTR* 86 (1993): 1-64. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 139-169.



וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת וַיִּתְּנָהּ אֶל־הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּנֵי לֵוִי הַנִּשְׁאָרִים אֶת־אֶרֶז בְּרִית יְהוָה  
וְאֶל־כָּל־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

[NJPS] Moses wrote down this Teaching and gave it to the priests, sons of Levi, who carried the Ark of the LORD's Covenant, and to all the elders of Israel. (Deuteronomy 31:9)

יִרְאוּ מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לְיַעֲקֹב וְתוֹרָתְךָ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְשִׁימוּ קְטוֹרֶה בְּאַפְּךָ וְכִלְיִל עַל־מִזְבִּיחֶךָ:

[NJPS] They shall teach Your laws to Jacob  
And Your instructions to Israel.  
They shall offer You incense to savor  
And whole-offerings on Your altar. (Deuteronomy 33:10)

Jubilees was not revealing something new in asserting the authority of the Levites to teach scriptures, so use of the genre “apocalypse” to reveal the chosenness of the Levites for this authority, especially when taken to the extremes of overkill, represents an ironic subversion. The second part of Chapter 4 discussed the contrast between a view of revelation as straightforward and a view of revelation as complex codes requiring special sages to decipher. It may be reasonable to associate with this point the authorization of Levites as purveyors of revelation, rather than some esoteric elite.

Along similar lines, Chapter 5 contrasted the unity of Israel in Jubilees with any chosen remnant or new branch within Israel, such as might be related to some form of sectarian leanings. The election of Levi is not an exception to this, mainly because the election of the Levites is a traditional distinction of public function, rather than a new or separatist distinction, as might be called sectarian. Jubilees holds on to the traditional division of labor between Levites and the rest of Israel, but the Levites serve the rest of Israel. The reaffirmation of the role of the Levites in Israel contradicts any new division of authority in the chosen line.

Chapter 6 explored the observation that the “eschatology” in Jubilees does not entail a new law, temple, creation, authority structure, etc., but represents a return to and

a fulfillment of the plan of creation that already climaxed in the fiftieth jubilee with the creation of the sanctuary. Other than the defilement of the sanctuary during the recent civil war, Jubilees is uncritical of the Jerusalem cult and priesthood. Although scholars have gone too far in the past in reconstructing a particular social setting and function of all the apocalypses, there is a basic level at which the genre lends itself to a critique of the current order and a proposal of a new order. The fact that Jubilees uses the genre “apocalypse” to reauthorize the traditional authority structures of Judaism represents an ironic subversion. The fact that it does it six times may demand an explanation beyond overkill in support of Levi.

The first argument for Levi’s election is an argument from merit. Levi earned the distinction just like Phinehas, who is present in the portrayal of Levi against Shechem in all but name. The use of the heavenly tablets, angelic liturgy, and angelic testimony to reinforce the argument from merit may be gratuitous.

[JCVK] 30:18 Levi’s descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel. 30:19 So blessing and justice before the God of all are entered for him as a testimony on the heavenly tablets. 30:20 We ourselves remember the justice which the man performed during his lifetime at all times of the year. As far as 1000 generations will they enter (it). It will come to him and his family after him. He has been recorded on the heavenly tablets as a friend and a just man. (Jubilees 30:18-20)

I do not mean to suggest that the primary point of this passage is to confront the apocalyptic worldview. Jubilees had a very serious concern to eliminate moral ambiguity in the slaughter of Shechem. The point is that this passage fits a broader pattern of use of the genre in the over-authorization of Levi.

The second authority brought to justify the elevation of Levi is the authority of prophecy. A prophetic spirit comes over Isaac, causing him to bless Levi with specific reference to his fated role in Israel.

[JCVK] 31:14 May the Lord give you and your descendants extremely great honor;  
may he make you and your descendants (alone) out of all humanity approach him  
to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones.  
The descendants of your sons will be like them in honor, greatness, and holiness.  
May he make them great throughout all the ages.  
31:15 They will be princes, judges, and leaders of all the descendants of Jacob's sons.  
They will declare the word of the Lord justly  
and will justly judge all his verdicts.  
They will tell my ways to Jacob  
and my paths to Israel.  
The blessing of the Lord will be placed in their mouths,  
so that they may bless all the descendants of the beloved. (Jubilees 31:14-15)

The reference to angelic liturgy and the ranks of angels is not the main point, but shows again that the use of typical apocalyptic literary elements pervades Jubilees, even when conveying an atypical worldview. The emphasis on the exclusion of the rest of humanity stands only in contrast to those apocalypses (and related literature) that assert an eschatological universal religion. The phrase “throughout all ages” asserts again that Levitical authority is not to be reformed in any future eschatological scenario. The service to the rest of Israel contrasts with any tendency toward sectarianism. This passage also fits the point discussed below, that the genre “apocalypse” is used to reveal the past, at least relative to the second century author.

A further point might be added, although I do not claim to have worked out the relationship between the genres “apocalypse” and “testament,” or the criteria for being

testament-like without actually being a testament. If one accepts that use of the genre “testament” fits with a discussion of the use of the genre “apocalypse,” and that the following introduction evokes reader associations with testaments, there may be some irony in the fact that Isaac does not actually die until Jubilees 36:18.

[JCVK] 31:8 Jacob went in to his father Isaac, to his bedroom where he was lying down. His two children were with him. He took his father’s hand, bent down, and kissed him. Isaac hung on his son Jacob’s neck and cried on his neck. ... 31:12 A spirit of prophecy descended into his mouth. He took Levi by his right hand and Judah by his left hand. 31:13 He turned to Levi first and began to bless him first. He said to him: ‘May the Lord of everything – he is the Lord of all ages – bless you and your sons throughout all ages...’ (Jubilees 31:8, 12-13)

The primary authorization here is the spirit of prophecy, but any resonance with testaments only amplifies the already six-fold authorization of Levi and the traditional *status quo* of Levitical authority.

The third and fourth authorizations of Levi are brief but noteworthy because they are logically independent. The third is the testimony of Jacob, who simply adds to the enthusiasm, and the fourth is the testimony of the angel of the presence (on behalf of the heavenly tablets) to Moses. (Judah is the other son referred to as having been blessed. It would take us in a different direction to discuss how only one son of Judah is blessed for kingship, not a permanent or eschatological dynasty [31:18].)

[JCVK] He [Jacob] said: ‘Now I know that I and my sons, too, have an eternal hope before the God of all’. This is the way it is ordained regarding the two of them, and it is entered for them as an eternal testimony on the heavenly tablets just as Isaac blessed them. (Jubilees 31:32)

Any one reference to “eternity” may not be decisive, but the persistent emphasis in the context of use of apocalyptic literary elements may be intended to subvert any suggestion

that a new law and priesthood has been appointed for the future. Two more reasons to love Levi remain.

The fifth authorization of Levi, his dream at Bethel, is not exclusively a feature of apocalypses, but fits the pattern of apocalyptic modes of revelation. As will be discussed below with respect to Joseph, the assertion of clear and straightforward revelation in dreams represents a departure from the typical view of dream revelation in apocalypses.

[JCVK] That night he stayed at Bethel. Levi dreamed that he – he and his sons – had been appointed and made into the priesthood of the most high God forever. When he awakened, he blessed the Lord. (Jubilees 32:1)

By now it is at least overkill that God just keeps revealing the same point over and over again. Apocalypses typically unveil something hidden, but nothing is hidden by now.

On one hand, it may be at least partly the case that the author of Jubilees is just enthusiastic in support of Levi and includes every known tradition and justification in support of Levi. On the other hand, if we may presume some authorial awareness of the net result and deliberate redaction, it may be significant that after the five foregoing points, Jacob still needs to find a reason to make Levi a priest. It may be even more significant that this point—alone among the six—has nothing to do with the revelation of hidden things. The final authorization of Levi is not revealed, but the product of legal observance of the law of tithe.

[JCVK] 32:2 Jacob got up early in the morning on the fourteenth day of this month and gave a tithe of everything which had come to him – from people to animals, from money to all utensils and clothing. He gave a tithe of everything. 32:3 At that time that Rachel became pregnant with her son Benjamin. Jacob counted his *sons* from him. He went up (the list), and it came down on Levi in the Lord's share. His father put priestly clothes on him and ordained him. (Jubilees 32:2-3)

Not only is the elevation of Levi overkill, and not only is it overkill with reference to apocalyptic revelation, the final authority is not apocalyptic. At least in a general sense the elevation of Levites as eternal rulers, priests, and bearers of scriptural authority in Israel is in tension with the apocalyptic worldview. The use and abuse of the apocalyptic literary genre in the process suggest a subversive intent.

7.11. Jubilees 39-43, “Do you not know that a man takes pleasure in his cup, as I do in this cup?” (the Joseph cycle)

As discussed in Chapter 4, Jubilees persistently and conspicuously avoids and removes any trace of divination or symbolic dreams as legitimate modes of revelation. There can be no question that the author consciously intended these variations from the base traditions of Genesis-Exodus (presumably motivated by Deuteronomy 18:10-14). It is also clear enough that the more mantic view of revelation is at least incidentally associated with the apocalyptic worldview, even if not limited to the apocalypses. The question that we take up here is whether Jubilees *subverts* the apocalyptic worldview by *avoiding* the typical literary elements of the apocalypses. This is not the usual argument from silence in as much as we can be confident the audience knew the story of Joseph. When a symbolic dream is simply avoided, such as the dreams of sheaves and stars, I would call it part of an intentional pattern, but not necessarily subversive. However, there are cases where Jubilees does not simply avoid a reference to dream interpretation and divination, but replaces it with a ridiculous substitute. It is reasonable to imagine the ancient audience was expected to know what has been altered, identify it as associated

with the apocalypses, and understand the alteration as a subversion of the worldview typical of the apocalypses.

First we should note several cases that may not be as conspicuous individually, depending on how Genesis-savvy a reader we assume, but contribute to a conspicuous pattern. Even Laban is spared the shame of divination when Genesis 30:27 is retold in Jubilees 29:6. In Jubilees 34:10 a reader familiar with Genesis 37 may notice the omission of the dreams of sheaves and stars. Jubilees 39:16 refers to the dreams of the butler and baker without any symbolic contents. Moving toward cases that are not just omissions but conspicuous variations, Jubilees 45:14 refers to the fact of Jacob's blessings in Genesis 49 without including any of the enigmatic contents. Similarly, Jubilees 40:1 retells Genesis 41 without a moment of suspense or profundity between dream and interpretation.

[JCVK] At that time the pharaoh had two dreams in one night about the subject of the famine which would come on the whole land.  
(Jubilees 40:1)

The most conspicuous subversion occurs in the variation on Joseph's divining cup. Many readers would remember why the cup was so important to Joseph in Genesis (he used it for divination), but the variation in Jubilees portrays Joseph as hyperbolically emotional about his silverware.

הָלֹא זֶה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁתֶּה אֲדֹנִי בּוֹ וְהוּא נִחַשׁ יִנְחֹשׁ בּוֹ הֲרַעַתָּם אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתֶם:

[NRSV] Is it not from this that my lord drinks? Does he not indeed use it for divination? You have done wrong in doing this. (Genesis 44:5)

... the cup with which I drink... (Jubilees 42:25)

וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם יוֹסֵף מִה־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתֶם הָלֹא יִדְעֵתֶם כִּי־נִחַשׁ יִנְחֹשׁ אִישׁ  
אֲשֶׁר כָּמֹנִי:

[NRSV] Joseph said to them, “What deed is this that you have done? Do you not know that one such as I can practice divination?” (Genesis 44:15)

[JCVK] Do you not know that a man takes pleasure in his cup, as I do in this cup? (Jubilees 43:10)

It would be different if Jubilees just avoided the issue, but Jubilees goes out of its way to force comparison by including the same sentences with a conspicuous variation. Precisely where the reader expects a divination cup there appears a drinking cup. The substitution is certainly intentional and certainly conveys a rejection of divination, and by extension the broader issue of access to encrypted revelation through wisdom. The use of irony to subvert a worldview does not necessarily entail humor, although this example may be ripe for analysis along those lines.<sup>11</sup>

#### 7.12. Jubilees 47-50, revealing the past

Jubilees reminds the reader of the revelatory framework throughout the book, but towards the end it becomes increasingly conspicuous that the revelation covers the past, up to the “present” of revelation at Sinai, and not substantially into the future. For example, the angel “reveals” to Moses his own embarrassing memories,

[JCVK] Then you were afraid and ran away because of this matter.  
(Jubilees 47:12)

---

<sup>11</sup> There are no certain arguments that something would have been funny 2160 years ago, but we might mention a modern analogy in support of such a possibility. In *Pink Cadillac* (1989), Clint Eastwood says, “You don’t mess with a man’s vehicle.” Taking this as a perhaps glib but basically serious base point of reference, we can use an internet search to identify variations on the phrase in internet popular culture. We find humorous variations such as, “You don’t mess with a man’s jelly donut / enchiladas / rain gauge / cake / TV remote / snowman / pudding / elephant.” It stands to reason that a similarly ironic demotion of importance from divination cup to drinking cup would constitute humor in, “Do you not know that a man takes pleasure in his cup, as I do in this cup?”



It is not unheard of for a historical apocalypse to reveal the past relative to the recipient of revelation (e.g., Animal Apocalypse), and it is very common to reveal the past relative to the actual composition. It is unheard of, however, for an apocalypse to stop there. Of course the major moderating point here is that Jubilees 23 does discuss the recent past of the second century author and venture a brief outline for the future. It remains significant, however, that the basic scope of the book from beginning to end is from creation to Sinai, just before the creation of the sanctuary. It has been argued that this was stated (with some ironic polyvalence) in Jubilees 1:26-29, and it is borne out in the end of the work. As does Deuteronomy, the conclusion of Jubilees indicates laws that will only become relevant in the future relative to Moses, after entry into the land, but these are not specific predictions.

[JCVK] 49:18 When the Israelites enter the land which they will possess—the land of Canaan—and set up the Lord’s tabernacle in the middle of the land in one of their tribal groups (until the time when the Lord’s temple will be built in the land), they are to come and celebrate the passover in the Lord’s tabernacle and sacrifice it before the Lord from year to year. 49:19 At the time when the house is built in the Lord’s name in the land which they will possess, they are to go there and sacrifice the passover in the evening when the sun sets, in the third part of the day.  
(Jubilees 49:18-19)

The basic structure of Jubilees reveals the past with the assertion that the past laws and consequences are eternal for all of the future. Jubilees 23 illustrates with recent examples, but even there basically re-reveals the same consequences revealed at Sinai. Thus, in fundamental worldview, if not in every particular, Jubilees reveals the past, with a secondary implication that the past holds the key to the future.

This is striking only in light of the use of the genre “apocalypse,” which forces comparison with typical apocalypses, which reveal something new for the future. Thus, the conclusion of Jubilees *sounds like* an eschatological promise typical of an apocalypse.

[JCVK] The jubilee [year]s will pass by until Israel is pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin, and error. Then they will live confidently in the entire land. They will no longer have any satan or any evil person. The land will be pure from that time until eternity.  
(Jubilees 50:5)

Like the covenantal blessings in Deuteronomy, the fulfillment of the plan has not yet been fully realized, so in that way the conclusion of Jubilees is future relative to the second century author. The difference, compared to the apocalypses, is that Jubilees is not expecting God to do anything in the future to bring about the ideal state. God is waiting for Israel, not vice versa. The laws for eternity began with the entry into the land, and theoretically Israel could have become pure and enjoyed the covenantal blessings anytime thereafter. Not only does Jubilees reveal the past as if an apocalypse, it asserts a worldview that looks to the past for the divine act required for “eschatological” restoration.

Jubilees uses irony to accentuate a deep difference in worldview. Jubilees does not harmonize covenant blessings with apocalyptic eschatology, it takes all of one worldview and uses the literary genre of the other to illustrate the differences. The persistent pattern suggests a mischievous intent to subvert the apocalyptic worldview.

## CONCLUSION

This has been the first study dedicated to the use of the literary genre “apocalypse” in Jubilees. Previous scholarship on the literary genre of Jubilees ignored the multiplicity of genres used. Previous scholarship on the apocalypses tended to include Jubilees as a hazy case. Scholars often noted ways in which Jubilees is like or unlike the apocalypses, but the pattern of similarities and differences was never systematized or explained. The present work has shown that Jubilees is not a hazy case among the apocalypses if precise definitions and distinctions are applied. At the level of literary genre, Jubilees clearly does use the genre. At the level of the worldview, Jubilees clearly disagrees with what is typically conveyed by the genre. Although Jubilees uses genres and addresses concerns not included in the present discussion, Jubilees is not composite or ambivalent on the issues implicitly raised by the use of the genre. It is precisely the passages that use the literary genre that comment negatively on the worldview typically implied. Furthermore, the differences in worldview are major. In some places the variation may be subtle, but it is usually unmistakable. Even without raising the question of authorial intent, the use of the genre can be described as ironic. The use of a literary genre raises reader expectations that the literature will be like other examples of the genre in the worldview conveyed concerning the typical literary elements. The discord between reader expectations and fulfillment is irony, regardless of the intent of the author.

Considered together, the quantity and quality of variations in Jubilees suggest an intentional use of the genre to subvert the worldview.

Chapter 2 reviewed the essential distinctions and definitions. The methodological foundation of the present work existed since the 1970s, even though it was not applied to Jubilees thoroughly. A distinction can be made between literary genre and worldview, and the typical relationship between them is subject to variation. The literary genre “apocalypse” can be defined morphologically, and Jubilees meets that definition. Perhaps the most enduring and legitimate reservation concerning the study of literary genre addresses the tendency to view the identification of literary genre as a scholarly end in itself. The present work should demonstrate that definitions can be used to identify variations and patterns that would have operated in the original context. The question is not whether Jubilees *is* an apocalypse, but *how* Jubilees uses the genre.

Chapter 3 addressed some foundational issues in the study of Jubilees. The argument of this dissertation does not depend on a small number of words, and could stand even if textual corruption was suspected in some cases. However, the reliability of the manuscripts available is striking, and should caution against hasty emendation. Similarly, the present argument could apply to the “final” version of Jubilees if composition occurred in multiple distinct stages. It is not the case that Jubilees can be explained as the sloppy combination of an apocalyptic source and an anti-apocalyptic source. The fact that Jubilees draws heavily from received traditions has its own significance, as discussed in Chapter 4, but does negate the basic coherence of composition. We should be aware of different conceptions of authorship in antiquity and modernity, but it is reasonable to refer to the person responsible for the work as we know it as the “author.” Although the use of the literary genre could be called ironic for any of

the plausible dates, the date of composition, even within a decade, does make a difference on some points. The point is not so much that Jubilees knew the Animal Apocalypse or the Danielic apocalypses in particular, but that Jubilees can be understood in historical context as a very different response to the civil war. Even with an earlier date one could imagine that the apocalyptic worldview and literary genre existed roughly as we know them, and included texts not known to us.

Chapters 4-6 followed the structure of the morphological definition of the literary genre “apocalypse,” and examined the worldview typically implied in the use of the three major parts: the revelatory framework, the spatial axis, and the temporal axis. Chapter 4 considered two essential points from the view of revelation typically conveyed through the revelatory framework of apocalypses. First, the revelatory framework typically authorizes “new” revelation, whereas Jubilees’ innovation works with publicly received authority. Second, Jubilees inverts the typically apocalyptic view of revelation as encrypted and accessible only through specific and limited channels of “wisdom.” Not only is Jubilees different in its view of revelation, it uses irony in framing publicly received, unambiguous authority as an uncovering of hidden things.

Chapter 5 turned to the distinctive elements of the apocalypses on the spatial axis, angels and demons, and the related issue of human agency. Apocalypses typically raise the issue of angels, demons, and similar unseen forces in order to claim that their drama explains the present moment in the human realm. Jubilees raises the issue, but asserts that no external agents ever interfere in the covenantal relationship between God and Israel, even temporarily. Jubilees uses angels and demons to explain the power and wickedness of foreign religion, but denies the applicability of the apocalyptic worldview to Israel under the covenant. In the audience’s present and eschatological future, precisely where

cosmic agents most take the stage in the typical apocalypses, Jubilees writes them out of relevance. As something of a corollary to the view of cosmic agents, Jubilees classifies humanity in atypical ways. Jubilees excludes the possibility of blurring the boundary between Israel and the nations, either to include foreigners or to exclude most of Israel from a new elect. The agency of Israel is decisive in the present moment, but the rejection of violence and proposed solution of repentance differ from the typical cluster of proposals on human agency.

Chapter 6 considered numerous subversions of the view of the temporal axis typically conveyed by the use of the genre “apocalypse.” The decline of history, the final woes, the judgment, and restoration all appear in Jubilees with fundamental variations. Three major points come out of the chapter. First, there was a fundamental difference in antiquity between the views of history and explanations of suffering that we might call Deuteronomistic and apocalyptic. Jubilees takes up the literary elements of the apocalyptic pattern of decline, woes, judgment, and restoration, but contorts the literary elements into a worldview of sin, punishment, repentance, and restoration. In particular, suffering is explained as punishment from God for covenantal infidelity, not a crisis in history imposed by external agents. Second, Jubilees takes up the idea of an “eschatological” turning point, but twists it from an anticipation of the imminent future to something already realized. This is primarily true in that the gradual restoration in Jubilees 23 is already underway, but on a deeper level it is true in that the decisive moment of history, the fulfillment of creation and beginning of eternity, occurred long ago with the creation of the sanctuary of Aaron in the jubilee of jubilees. This raises the third point, that the “restoration” in jubilees does not entail a new heaven, earth, creation, covenant, law, temple, or priesthood. The eternal plan for creation is already found in the

past, and merely needs to be realized and restored through human covenantal fidelity and purity.

The last chapter went through the key passages of ironic use of the genre in the sequence of the book. It should be clear from this that the irony is not limited to a small number of words or passages, although the framework of the beginning, middle and end of the work do have special importance. It should also be clear that the quantity and quality of subversion makes it unlikely that the pattern can be explained as merely an accident or by-product of other concerns. It is easy to imagine that the use of irony was intentional, but hard to imagine that it was intended to harmonize, or at least that such an expectation would have been reasonable. Jubilees is uncompromising in worldview, and adopts only superficial literary elements from the texts with which it so strongly disagrees. It is difficult to be more precise in characterizing the subversion of a worldview with ironic use of literary genre. There are dangers in explaining literary tensions with social models that themselves derive from interpretations of literature. It is very difficult to establish and characterize humor and ridicule across cultures. The reader is left to imagine whether Jubilees should be labeled as parody, polemic, friendly prodding or bitter satire.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, William. "Introduction." In *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler, 1-31. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- . "Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography." In *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, edited by John C. Reeves, 143-171. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994.
- Albeck, Chanoch. *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*, Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 47. Berlin: Berlin-Schöneberg, 1930.
- Albright, William Foxwell. *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940.
- . *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1957.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Retelling the Old Testament." In *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, edited by Donald A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 99-121. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988.
- Alt, Albrecht. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3 vols. München: Beck, 1959.
- Anderson, Gary A. *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- . "The Status of the Torah Before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Document and the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 1 (1994): 1-29.
- Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 8. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Assefa, Daniel. *L'Apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85-90): une propagande militaire?: Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques*, JSJSup 120. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Aune, David E. "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 65-96.
- . "Qumran and the Book of Revelation." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 622-648. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Baars, W., and R. Zuurmond. "The Project for a New Edition of the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 9 (1964): 67-74.
- Barker, Margaret. "Beyond the Veil of the Temple: The High Priestly Origins of the Apocalypses." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51, no. 1 (1998): 1-21.



- Barr, James. "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 58 (1975): 9-35.
- Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton Longman and Todd, 1986.
- . "The Significance of a Fixed Canon of the Hebrew Bible." In *Hebrew Bible Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, edited by Magne Sæbø, 67-83. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Baumgarten, J. M. "The Laws of Orlah and First Fruits in Light of Jubilees, The Qumran Writings, and the Targum Ps-Jonathan." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (1987): 195-202.
- Baynes, Leslie. "'My Life is Written Before You': The Function of the Motif 'Heavenly Book' in Judeo-Christian Apocalypses, 200 B.C.E.-200 C.E." Dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame, 2004.
- Bedenbender, Andreas. *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte 8. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000.
- . "Jewish Apocalypticism: A Child of Mantic Wisdom?" *Henoch* 24 (2002): 189-196.
- . "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature." In *The Early Enoch Literature*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, 65-79. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VTSup 68. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- Berger, Klaus. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Band 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981.
- Berner, Christoph. "50 Jubilees and Beyond? Some Observations on the Chronological Structure of the Book of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions." In *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick and Michael E. Stone, 1-26. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.
- . "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-196.
- Betz, Hans D. "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalyptic." *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969): 134-156.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "The Judaeen Priesthood During the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: A Hypothetical Reconstruction." *CBQ* 60, no. 1 (1998): 25-43.

- Blum, Erhard. "Formgeschichte—A Misleading Category? Some Critical Remarks." In *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney, 32-45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism: The Heavenly Tablets in Jubilees as the Foundation of a Competing Halakha." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- . "Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship." In *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium*, edited by John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, 33-50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- . "The Solar Calendars of Daniel and Enoch." In *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, edited by John J. Collins, Peter W. Flint and Cameron VanEpps, 311-328. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2001.
- Bohn, F. "Die Bedeutung des Buches der Jubiläen: Zum 50jährigen Jubiläum der ersten, deutschen Übersetzung." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken; eine Zeitschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Theologie* 73 (1900): 167-184.
- Brooke, George J. "Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1-2: New Light from 4QJubilees<sup>a</sup>." In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, 39-57. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Buber, Martin. *Kampf um Israel: Reden und Schriften (1921-1932)*. Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1933.
- Buss, Martin J. *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, JSOTSup 274. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Caquot, André. "Les enfants aux cheveux blancs: réflexions sur un motif." In *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*, 161-172. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 163-170. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- . "Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique: son emploi à Qumrân." *RdQ* 10, no. 1 (1979): 3-33.
- Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- . *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*. London: A. and C. Black, 1902.
- . *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- . *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments*, Home University Library of Modern Knowledge. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1914.

- Charles, R. H., and G. H. Box. *The Book of Jubilees; or The Little Genesis*. London, New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Macmillan, 1917.
- Charlesworth, James H. "The Date of Jubilees and of the Temple Scroll." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 193-204.
- . "What Is an Apocalyptic Text, and How Do We Know That? Seeking the Provenience of the Book of the Watchers." *Henoch* 30, no. 1 (2008): 37-41.
- Coblentz Baugh, Kelley. "What Becomes of the Angels' 'Wives'? A Text-Critical Study of 1 Enoch 19:2." *JBL* 125, no. 4 (2006): 766-780.
- Cody, Aelred. *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "Introduction." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 1-11.
- . "Review of *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* by Christopher Rowland." *JBL* 103 (1984): 465-467.
- Collins, John J. "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1-19.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- . "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers." *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91-111.
- . "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 403-430. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London; New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *JBL* 94 (1975): 218-234.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- . "Ethos and Identity in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." In *Ethos und Identität: Einheit und Vielfalt des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, edited by Matthias Konradt and Ulrike Steinert, 51-65. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2002.
- . "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End." In *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism Volume I, the Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, edited by John J. Collins, 129-161. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- . "Genre, Ideology, and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism." In *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium*, edited by John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, 11-32. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . "The Legacy of Apocalypticism." In *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 155-166. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . "The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

- and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by Florentino García Martínez, 287-305. Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003.
- . "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe." In *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak, 44-52. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- . "Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism." In *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick and Michael E. Stone, 43-58. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.
- . "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility." In *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, edited by L. G. Perdue, 165-185. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1993. Reprint, *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Crislip, Andrew. "The *Book of Jubilees* in Coptic: An Early Christian *Florilegium* on Family of Noah." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 40 (2003): 27-44.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Heil als Geschichte: heilsgeschichtliche Existenz im Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1965.
- . *Salvation in History*. 1st American ed. New York,: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, *Studia Post-Biblica* 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Davies, Graham I. "Apocalyptic and Historiography." *Journal of the Old Testament* 5 (1978): 15-28.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." In *Modern Genre Theory*, edited by David Duff, 219-231. Harlow, England; New York: Longman, 2000. Reprint, originally published in *Glyph* 7 (1980), 202-213. Translated by Avital Ronell.
- Di Lella, Alexander A., and Patrick W. Skehan. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, *Anchor Bible* 39. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987.
- Dibelius, Martin. "Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien." *Theologische Rundschau* N. F. 1 (1929): 185-216.
- Dillmann, August. "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis." *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 2-3 (1850-1851): 230-256; 1-96.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *Vetus Testamentum* 33, no. 1 (1983): 14-29.
- . "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4." In *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint: Essays Presented to Eugene Ulrich on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Peter W. Flint, James C. VanderKam and Emanuel Tov, 230-249. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- . "בני שמים - תורת המלאכים בספר היובלים לאור כתבי עדת קומראן." In *מנחה לשרה; מחקרים בפילוסופיה יהודית ובקבלה: מוגשים לפרופסור שרה א' הלר וילנסקי*, edited by Moshe Idel, Devorah Dimant and Shalom Rosenberg, 97-118. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994.

- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 2 (2007): 235-286.
- . "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 5, no. 3 (2007): 367-432.
- Dix, G. H. "The Enochic Pentateuch." *JTS* 27 (1925-1926): 29-42.
- Doering, Lutz. "Jub 50:6-13 als Schlussabschnitt des Jubiläenbuchs—Nachtrag aus Qumran oder ursprünglicher Bestandteil des Werks?" *RdQ* 20, no. 79 (2002): 359-387.
- . *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Doran, Robert. "The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34-38; 23:14-32 in Narrative Context." *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1-11.
- Doty, William G. "The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis." In *The Society of Biblical Literature, One Hundred Eighth Annual Meeting Book of Seminar Papers*, edited by Lane C. McGaughy, 413-448. Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "Priestly Education in the Aramaic Levi Document (*Visions of Levi*) and Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208-211)." *RdQ* 22 (2006): 547-574.
- . "Some Notes on Scribal Craft and the Origins of the Enochic Literature." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- Elgvin, Torleif. "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic." In *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998*, edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller, 15-38. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, CBQMS 18. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987.
- . "Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees." Dissertation, Vanderbilt, 1982.
- Erder, Yoram. "'שר משטמה' בחיבור קרא'." *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 243-246.
- Eshel, Hanan. "Three New Fragments from Qumran Cave 11." *DSD* 8, no. 1 (2001): 1-8.
- Feldman, Louis H. "Josephus' Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with 1 Maccabees." In *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers, 41-68. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka." *HTR* 16, no. 1 (1923): 39-61.
- . "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah (Concluded)." *HTR* 36, no. 1 (1943): 1-38.
- . "Some Examples of the Maccabean Halaka." *JBL* 49, no. 1 (1930): 20-42.
- Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Fishelov, David. *Metaphors of Genre: The Role of Analogies in Genre Theory*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, Biblica et Orientalia; 18B. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004.
- Flannery-Dailey, Frances. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*, JSJSup 90. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- . "Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature." In *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*, edited by April D. De Conick, 231-247. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. "Jewish Apocalypticism." In *The Handbook of the Study of the Historical Jesus*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and T. Holmén. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- Forsyth, Neil. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- . "The Life and Death of Literary Forms." *New Literary History* 2 (1971): 199-216.
- Frow, John. *Genre*. Edited by John Drakakis, The New Critical Idiom. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Gafni, Isaiah. "Josephus and I Maccabees." In *Josephus, the Bible, and History*, edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, 116-131. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- Gammie, John G. "The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel." *JBL* 95 (1976): 191-204.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: the Qumran Texts in English*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Leiden; New York; Grand Rapids: E.J. Brill; W.B. Eerdmans, 1996.
- . "Encore l'apocalyptique." *JSJ* 17 (1986): 224-232.
- . "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, 243-260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert Tigchelaar. "11QJubilees." In *Qumran Cave 11*, edited by Florentino García Martínez, Eibert Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, 207-220. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden Brill, 1999.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-1928.
- . "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings." *JBL* 41, no. 1-2 (1922): 115-136.
- Goff, Matthew J. *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- . *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, STDJ 50. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Goldman, M. "ספר היובלים." In *הספרים החיצונים*, edited by Abraham Kahana, 216-313. Jerusalem: Makor, 1978.

- Goldstein, Jonathan A. "The Date of the Book of Jubilees." In *Semites, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in Their Interactions*, 161-180. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking." In *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*, edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak, 107-133. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and Michael E. Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *HTR* 70 (1977): 51-65.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, Bd. 14. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.
- Gunkel, Hermann. "Jesaia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie. Ein Vortrag." *ZAW* 42 (1924): 177-208.
- . "Problems of Hebrew Literary History." In *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, edited by Alexander Kennedy Dallas, 57-68. New York: Macmillan, 1928.
- . *Reden und Aufsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Gunkel, Hermann, and Heinrich Zimmern. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. "The Festivals of Pesah and Massot in The Book of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- Hanneken, Todd R. "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses." *Henoch* 28, no. 2 (2006): 11-25.
- Hanson, Paul D. "Apocalypse, Genre and Apocalypticism." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*, edited by Keith R. Crim, 27-34. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- . *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- . "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment." *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971): 31-58.
- . "Prolegomena to the Study of Jewish Apocalyptic." In *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, edited by Werner E. Lemke, Patrick D. Miller and Frank Moore Cross, 389-413. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution*. Wilmington, Delaware: M. Glazier, 1988.
- Hartman, Lars. *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5*, CB.NT 12. Lund: Gleerup, 1979.
- . "An Early Example of Jewish Exegesis: 1 Enoch 10:16—11:2." *Neotestamentica* 17 (1983): 16-27.
- . "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 329-343. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Hartom, E. S. "ספר היובלות." In *הספרים החיצונים: ספורי אגדה*. Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1965.

- Hellholm, David. "Introduction." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 1-6. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- . "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 13-64.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. 1st American ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Die jüdische Apokalypik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christenthums. Nebst einem Anhang über das gnostische System des Basilides*. Jena: Mauke, 1857. Reprint, Amsterdam: Rodopi 1966.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "The Book of Jubilees and Early Jewish Mysticism." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- . "Jubilees and Sectarianism." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, 129-131. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*, Jewish Culture and Contexts. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- . "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13, no. 1 (1978): 259-269.
- . "Some Echoes of *Jubilees* in Medieval Hebrew Literature." In *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, edited by John C. Reeves, 115-141. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994.
- . "Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the *Book of Jubilees*." In *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, edited by Benjamin G. Wright, 19-29. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999.
- . *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Jaubert, Annie. *The Date of the Last Supper*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965.
- Jellinek, Adolph. "ספר נח." In *בית המדרש*, 155-160. Yerushalayim: Sifre Vahrmann, 1967.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Satan: A Biography*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kister, Menahem. "Some Aspects of Qumran Halakhah." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, edited by Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, 571-588. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1992.
- . "בחזון החיות, ספר היובלים וברית דמשק לתולדות בן האיסים: עיונים." *Tarbiz* 56, no. 1 (1986): 1-18.
- . "על שני מטבעות לשון בספר היובלים." *Tarbiz* 70, no. 2 (2001): 289-300.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.



- Knibb, Michael A. "The Book of Enoch in the Light of the Qumran Wisdom Literature." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by Florentino García Martínez, 193-210. Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003.
- . "Jubilees and the Origins of the Qumran Community." In *Inaugural Lecture in the Department of Biblical Studies, King's College, London, 17 January 1989*, 1989.
- . "Which Parts of 1 *Enoch* Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16-25." In *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines*, edited by J. Cheryl Exum, H. G. M. Williamson and David J. A. Clines, 254-262. London; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Knierim, Rolf. "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered." *Interpretation* 27, no. 4 (1973): 435-468.
- Knoppers, Gary N. "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood." *JBL* 118, no. 1 (1999): 49-72.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*. Translated by S. M. Cupitt. New York,: Scribner, 1969.
- . *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik. Eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970.
- . *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Naperville: Allenson, 1972.
- . *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1964.
- . *Was ist Formgeschichte? Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*. 2., durchgängig überarb. Aufl. ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1967.
- Kugel, James L. *The Bible As It Was*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997.
- . *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1990.
- . "The Jubilees Apocalypse." *DSD* 1 (1994): 322-337.
- . *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- . "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *HTR* 86 (1993): 1-64.
- . *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, Early Judaism and Its Literature 9. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. "Jubilees—Between Enoch and Moses: A Narrative Reading." *JSJ* 35, no. 3 (2004): 243-261.

- . *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Lambdin, Thomas Oden. *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)*, Harvard Semitic Studies 24. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Lange, Armin. "Divinatorische Träume und Apokalyptik im Jubiläenbuch." In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, 25-38. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.
- . "Interpretation als Offenbarung: Zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by Florentino García Martínez, 17-33. Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2003.
- Leslau, Wolf. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English, English-Ge'ez, with an Index of the Semitic Roots*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1987.
- Lieber, Elinor. "Asaf's 'Book of Medicines': A Hebrew Encyclopedia of Greek and Jewish Medicine, Possibly Compiled in Byzantium on an Indian Model." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 38 (1984): 233-249.
- Littmann, E. "Das Buch der Jubiläen." In *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, edited by E. Kautzsch, 31-118. Freiburg; Leipzig: Mohr [Siebeck], 1900.
- Lücke, Friedrich. *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes: oder, Allgemeine Untersuchungen über die apokalyptische Litteratur überhaupt und die Apokalypse des Johannes insbesondere*. 2. verm. und verb. Aufl. ed, Commentar über die Schriften des Evang. Johannes. Bonn: Weber, 1852.
- . *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Litteratur*, Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes. Bonn: Bey Eduard Weber, 1832.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSup 115. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Mach, Michael. "Demons." In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 176-178. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Machiela, Daniel. "From Enoch to Abram: The Text and Character of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) in Light of Related Second Temple Jewish Literature." Dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame, 2007.
- Matlock, R. Barry. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, JSNTSup 127. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Mendels, Doron. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 15. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987.
- Meyer, Eduard. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*. 3 vols. Stuttgart; Berlin: Cotta, 1924.
- Milik, Jozef T. "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran." *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 49-67.

- Milik, Jozef T., and Matthew Black. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik." In *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971*, edited by P. A. H. de Boer, 268-293. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Najman, Hindy. "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies." *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379-410.
- . *Prophetic Ends: Concepts of the Revelatory in Late Ancient Judaism*, 2008.
- . *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup 77. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Spying out the Land: A Report from Genology." In *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel and Dennis Robert Magary, 437-450. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Nielsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001.
- . "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600.
- . "Enochic Wisdom and its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah." In *The Early Enoch Literature*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, 81-94. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- . "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?" In *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, edited by Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, 123-132. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumran Fragments." In *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick and Michael E. Stone, 91-119. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Vol. 26, Harvard Theological Studies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- . "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture." In *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm, 333-354. Oslo: Scandanavian University Press, 1995.
- . "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion." In *George W.E. Nielsburg in Perspective: an Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck, 267-287. Boston, MA: Brill, 2003. Reprint, first published in *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers* 33, edited by Eugene H. Lovering, 715-732. Atlanta: Scholars, 1994.
- Olyan, Saul M. "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood." *HTR* 80 (1987): 261-286.
- . "Zadok's Origins and the Tribal Politics of David." *JBL* 101, no. 2 (1982): 177-193.
- Owen, Paul. "The Relationship of Eschatology to Esoteric Wisdom in the Jewish Pseudepigraphal Apocalypses." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish*

- Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, edited by Craig A. Evans, 122-133. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Origin of Satan*. New York: Random House, 1995.
- Pastor, Jack. "The Famine in 1 Maccabees: History or Apology?" In *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*, edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, 31-43. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Paul, Shalom M. "Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life." In *The Gaster Festschrift*, edited by David Marcus, 345-353. New York: ANE Society, 1974.
- Peerbolte, L. J. Lietaert. *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents*, JSJSup 49. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1996.
- Philonenko, Marc. "L'apocalyptique qoumrânienne." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 211-218. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 204. Tübingen; Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck; Baker Academic, 2005.
- Puech, Émile. "Une nouvelle copie du Livre des Jubilés: 4Q484 = pap4Jubilés<sup>j</sup>." *RdQ* 19, no. 74 (1999): 261-264.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology*. Vol. 2. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Ravid, Leora. "The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar - A Reexamination." *DSD* 10, no. 3 (2003): 371-394.
- . "6-13 הלכות השבת בספר היובלים נ." *Tarbiz* 69, no. 2 (2000): 161-166.
- . "המינוח המיוחד של לוחות השמים בספר היובלים." *Tarbiz* 68, no. 4 (1999): 463-471.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Angels, Demons, and the Dangerous Ones in Between: Reflections on Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in *Jubilees*." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- . *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Regev, Eyal. "Jubilees, Qumran and the Essenes." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran." In *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Ruth Clements, John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling, 1-11. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Rollmann, Hans. "Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78, no. 3 (1981): 276-288.
- Rönsch, H. *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1874.

- Rowland, Christopher. "The Intertestamental Literature." In *The History of Christian Theology, Volume Two: The Study and Use of the Bible*, edited by P. Avis, 151-225. Basingstoke; Grand Rapids: Marshall Pickering; Eerdmans, 1988.
- . *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- . "Review of: *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*, by John J. Collins; and *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone." *Journal of Theological Studies* 37, no. 2 (1986): 484-490.
- Rowley, H. H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*. New and revised 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Greenwood, NC: Attic Press, 1980.
- Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van. "A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch?" In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, 90-93. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 66. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Russell, D. S. *The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 BC-AD 100*, The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Sacchi, Paolo. "The Book of the Watchers as an Apocalyptic and Apocryphal Text." *Henoch* 30, no. 1 (2008): 9-26.
- . *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. Translated by William J. Short, JSPSup 20. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Sanders, E. P. "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 447-459. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- . *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Schmidt, Johann Michael. *Die jüdische Apokalypik*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1969.
- Schmithals, Walter. *The Apocalyptic Movement, Introduction & Interpretation*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Schubert, Friedemann. *Tradition und Erneuerung: Studien zum Jubiläenbuch und seinem Trägerkreis*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe III, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 771. Frankfurt am Main; New York: Lang, 1998.
- Schürer, Emil. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 3 vols. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1898.
- . *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 2. neubearb. Aufl. des Lehrbuchs der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte ed. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886.
- . *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1874.
- Schürer, Emil, Géza Vermès, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*. revised ed. 3 vols. Vol. 3, part 1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885, 1986.

- Schwarz, Eberhard. *Identität durch Abgrenzung: Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen: zugleich ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Jubiläenbuches*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XXIII, Theologie 162. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1982.
- Scott, James M. *On Earth As In Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 91. Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Seeligmann, Isac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Segal, Michael. "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible." In *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, edited by Matthias Henze, 10-28. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- . "The Relationship Between the Legal and Narrative Passages in 'Jubilees'." In *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements, 203-228. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . "סיפורת וחוק בספר היובלים: עיון מחודש בסיפור הכניסה לגן עדן." *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 111-125.
- . "ספר היובלים: שכתוב המקרא, עריכה, אמונות ודעות." Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2004.
- Sinding, Michael. "After Definitions: Genre, Categories, and Cognitive Science." *Genre* 35 (2002): 181-220.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "Wisdom and Apocalyptic." In *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity: Essays in Conversation with Geo Widengren*, edited by Birger Albert Pearson, 131-156. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Smith, Morton. "On the History of Αποκαλυπτω and Αποκαλυσψις." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 9-20. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, edited by David Hellholm, 496-530. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983.
- Stone, Michael E. "Apocalyptic Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 383-441. Assen, Philadelphia: Van Gorcum, Fortress, 1984.
- . "The Book(s) Attributed to Noah." *DSD* 13, no. 1 (2006): 4-23.
- . "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." In *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, edited by Werner E. Lemke, Patrick D. Miller and Frank Moore Cross, 414-452. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.

- . “The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.” In *The Fall of the Angels*, edited by Christoph Auffarth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 87-118. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Sturm, Richard E. “Defining the Word ‘Apocalyptic’: A Problem in Biblical Criticism.” In *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, 17-48. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Suter, David Winston. “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16.” *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115-135.
- . “Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 ‘Enoch’ 6-16.” *Henoch* 25, no. 2 (2003): 167-212.
- Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. “The Crystallization of the ‘Canon of Hebrew Scriptures’ in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran.” In *The Bible as Book*, edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, 5-20. London: British Library, 2002.
- Testuz, Michel. *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*. Genève: E. Droz, 1960.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert. “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses.” *JSJ* 18 (1987): 137-144.
- . *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*, Oudtestamentische studiën 35. New York: Brill, 1996.
- Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- Ulrich, Eugene. “From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text’s Authoritativeness.” *DSD* 10, no. 1 (2003): 3-25.
- . “The Notion and Definition of Canon.” In *The Canon Debate*, edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders, 21-35. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Ulrich, Eugene, and Frank Moore Cross. *Qumran Cave 4*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, Torleif Elgvin, Jozef Milik, Saul M. Olyan, John Strugnell, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam and Richard T. White. Vol. 9 Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings, DJD 14. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- VanderKam, James C. “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees.” In *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick and Michael E. Stone, 151-170. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.
- . “The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees.” In *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, edited by Shemaryahu Talmon, James A. Sanders and Craig A. Evans, 241-261. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.
- . “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *DSD* 5, no. 3 (1998): 382-402.
- . *The Book of Jubilees*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. 2 vols. Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989.
- . *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London; New York: Routledge, 1998.

- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994.
- . “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*.” In *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* edited by Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger and Diethard Römheld, 339-364. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- . “The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6-13 and the Unity of the Book.” In *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, edited by Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, 267-284. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources.” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13, no. 1 (1978): 229-251.
- . *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- . *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- . “Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2.” *DSD* 1, no. 3 (1994): 300-321.
- . “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4.” In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, edited by Julio C. Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, 635-648. Leiden, New York: Brill, 1992.
- . “Jubilees’ Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest.” In *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, 545-561. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
- . “The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees.” In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, 3-24. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . “The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought.” In *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane*, edited by James D. Martin and Philip R Davies, 163-176. Sheffield: JSOT, 1986.
- . “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26 (1981): 209-217.
- . “Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls ” In *The Canon Debate*, edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders, 91-109. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- . “The Scriptural Setting of the Book of Jubilees.” *DSD* 13, no. 1 (2006): 61-72.
- . “Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1-10; 91:11-17).” In *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, 366-379. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
- . “Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees.” In *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, 522-544. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
- . “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1.” In *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*,



- edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly Bow and Rodney Alan Werline, 266-279. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- . *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- VanderKam, James C., and Jozef T. Milik. "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication." *JBL* 110 (1991): 243-270.
- . "Jubilees." In *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts Part 1*, edited by Harold W. Attridge, Torleif Elgvin, Jozef Milik, Saul M. Olyan, John Strugnell, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam and Richard T. White, 1-185. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- VanderKam, James C., and George W. E. Nickelsburg. *1 Enoch: A New Translation, Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Vermès, Géza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1997.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. "Apocalypses and Related Subjects." In *New Testament Apocrypha*, edited by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, 581-607. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur dargestellt*. Tübingen,: Mohr, 1934.
- Wacholder, B. Z. "Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment." In *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995*, edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and J. Kampen, 195-211. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, no. 8. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Edinburgh A. & C. Black, 1885. Reprint, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Werman, Cana. "היחס לגויים בספר היובלים ובספרות קומראן בהשוואה להלכה התנאית הקדומה." Dissertation, Hebrew University, 1995.
- . "ספר היובלים ועדת קומראן: לשאלת היחס בין השניים." *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 37-55.
- . "The תורה and the תעודה Engraved on The Tablets." *DSD* 9, no. 1 (2002): 75-103.
- Wiesenberg, Ernest. "The Jubilee of Jubilees." *RdQ* 9, no. 3 (1961-1962): 3-40.
- Wintermute, O. S. "Jubilees." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 35-142. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.
- Wray, T. J., and Gregory Mobley. *The Birth of Satan: Tracing the Devil's Biblical Roots*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood." In *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*, edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes, 189-222. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.

- . “Jubilees, Sirach, and Sapiential Tradition.” In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (the as yet unpublished proceedings of the 2007 Enoch Seminar)*, 2007.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. “The Book of Jubilees: Its Character and its Significance.” *JQR* 30 (1939): 1-31.
- . “Criteria for the Dating of Jubilees.” *JQR* 36, no. 2 (1945): 187-189.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Hermeneia*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Zuurmond, R. “Het oordeel over Kaïn in de oud-joodse traditie.” *Amsterdamse cahiers voor exegese en bijbelse theologie* 3 (1982): 107-116.

## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Adler, William, 30, 42, 97, 113, 239  
 Albeck, Chanoch, 133, 214, 216  
 Albright, William Foxwell, 142, 143, 177  
 Alexander, Philip S., 165, 188, 192, 210, 230, 241, 246, 441  
 Alt, Albrecht, 53  
 Anderson, Gary A., 247, 266  
 Argall, Randal A., 210, 218, 236, 237, 238, 280, 385, 387, 397, 485  
 Assefa, Daniel, 333, 362  
 Aune, David E., 53, 87, 94, 96, 99, 104, 105, 152  
 Baars, W., 113  
 Barr, James, 30, 34, 37, 39, 45, 62, 63, 71, 77, 80, 81, 85  
 Barton, John, 70, 186  
 Baumgarten, J. M., 133  
 Baynes, Leslie, 212, 217  
 Bedenbender, Andreas, 188, 206, 233, 378  
 Beentjes, Pancratius C., 280, 281, 441  
 Ben-Dov, Jonathan, 26, 28, 431  
 Berger, Klaus, 143, 165, 173  
 Berner, Christoph, 123  
 Bernstein, Moshe J., 152, 183  
 Betz, Hans D., 187  
 Blenkinsopp, Joseph, 324  
 Blum, Erhard, 46, 50  
 Boccaccini, Gabriele, 25, 26, 30, 63, 125, 152, 188, 229, 231, 248, 280  
 Bohn, F., 143, 164  
 Brooke, George J., 211, 219  
 Buber, Martin, 34  
 Buss, Martin J., 46, 48, 49, 52  
 Caquot, André, 380  
 Carmignac, Jean, 43, 58, 63, 65, 71, 73, 74, 77, 82, 88, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 240  
 Charles, R. H., 67, 113, 115, 121, 144, 164, 165, 224, 225, 288, 290, 340, 384, 396, 399, 414, 425, 445, 467  
 Charlesworth, James H., 30, 34, 61, 142, 147, 165  
 Coblenz Bautch, Kelley, 270  
 Cody, Aelred, 324  
 Collins, Adela Yarbro, 38, 86, 94, 100, 104, 105, 106  
 Collins, John J., 7, 9, 11, 18, 30, 34, 36, 40, 45, 54, 58, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 74, 76, 77, 79, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 110, 128, 152, 162, 185, 187, 195, 197, 198, 200, 202, 204, 206, 207, 217, 233, 238, 239, 244, 303, 313, 314, 315, 325, 326, 328, 335, 336, 353, 354, 378, 389  
 Crislip, Andrew, 112  
 Cross, Frank Moore, 278, 324  
 Cullmann, Oscar., 41  
 Davenport, Gene L., 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 129, 228, 229, 384  
 Derrida, Jacques, 4  
 Di Lella, Alexander A., 441, 442  
 Dibelius, Martin, 46, 51  
 Dillmann, August, 28, 142  
 Dimant, Devorah, 126, 130, 131, 148  
 DiTommaso, Lorenzo, 34  
 Dix, G. H., 188  
 Doering, Lutz, 122, 151  
 Doran, Robert, 164  
 Doty, William G., 50, 52, 54, 55, 56  
 Drawnel, Henryk, 249  
 Dupont, Jacques, 47  
 Elgvin, Torleif, 233  
 Endres, John C., 143, 211, 223, 225  
 Erder, Yoram, 120  
 Eshel, Hanan, 119  
 Feldman, Louis H., 163

- Finkelstein, Louis, 143, 144, 152, 160, 162, 165, 214, 216  
 Fishbane, Michael A., 202, 204, 244  
 Fishelov, David, 108  
 Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 147  
 Flannery-Dailey, Frances, 68, 69, 98, 253  
 Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T., 36, 64, 65, 68, 69, 456  
 Forsyth, Neil, 19, 291  
 Fowler, Alastair, 83, 103  
 Frow, John, 4  
 Gafni, Isaiah, 163  
 Gammie, John G., 82, 97  
 García Martínez, Florentino, 103, 118, 189, 199, 212, 214, 216, 217, 218, 289  
 Ginzberg, Louis, 25, 34  
 Goff, Matthew J., 103, 233  
 Goldman, M., 112  
 Goldstein, Jonathan A., 143  
 Grabbe, Lester L., 67  
 Greenfield, Jonas C., 188  
 Gruenwald, Ithamar, 100  
 Gunkel, Hermann, 35, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 62, 103, 105, 167, 238  
 Halpern-Amaru, Betsy, 297  
 Hanneken, Todd R., 215, 269, 277  
 Hanson, Paul D., 18, 30, 34, 35, 38, 40, 44, 45, 48, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 70, 71, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 100, 222, 279, 312  
 Harrington, Daniel J., 168  
 Hartman, Lars, 47, 62, 63, 76, 77, 105, 188  
 Hartom, E. S., 112  
 Hellholm, David, 43, 63, 76, 90, 94, 104, 105, 106, 191  
 Hengel, Martin, 233  
 Hilgenfeld, Adolf, 38  
 Himmelfarb, Martha, 25, 93, 113, 162, 212, 231, 275, 290, 425, 434  
 Jaubert, Annie, 143  
 Jellinek, Adolph, 113, 275, 290  
 Kelly, Henry Ansgar, 291  
 Kister, Menahem, 21, 114, 122, 123, 126, 128, 133, 134, 159, 160, 161, 170, 213, 381  
 Klawans, Jonathan, 423, 447  
 Knibb, Michael A., 143, 154, 155, 189, 237, 238  
 Knierim, Rolf, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56  
 Knoppers, Gary N., 324  
 Koch, Klaus, 18, 34, 35, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 67, 70, 71, 77, 81, 85, 87, 100, 102  
 Kugel, James L., 132, 144, 147, 150, 211, 219, 220, 222, 230, 244, 246, 296, 404, 415, 438, 446, 453, 499  
 Kugler, Robert A., 147, 499  
 Kvanvig, Helge S., 26, 187, 248, 249  
 Lambdin, Thomas Oden, 453  
 Lange, Armin, 18, 28, 199, 210, 212, 215, 234, 253, 254, 255, 274  
 Leslau, Wolf, 372  
 Lieber, Elinor., 275  
 Littmann, E., 143  
 Lücke, Friedrich, 37, 81  
 Macaskill, Grant, 233, 408  
 Mach, Michael, 297  
 Machiela, Daniel, 230  
 Matlock, R. Barry, 70  
 Mendels, Doron, 144, 164, 165, 343, 403  
 Meyer, Eduard, 143  
 Milik, Jozef T., 113, 114, 116, 117, 146, 165, 188, 421, 422, 444  
 Mobley, Gregory, 291, 299, 306  
 Moltmann, Jürgen, 85  
 Müller, Hans-Peter, 67, 233  
 Najman, Hindy, 184, 201, 209, 210, 211, 212, 231, 246  
 Newsom, Carol A., 4, 107  
 Nickelsburg, George W. E., 143, 154, 155, 156, 184, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 199, 223, 225, 231, 237, 238, 240, 266, 267, 316, 317, 320, 362, 364, 365, 387, 410, 484  
 Olyan, Saul M., 280, 324  
 Owen, Paul, 64, 68  
 Pagels, Elaine, 291, 299  
 Pastor, Jack, 171  
 Paul, Shalom M., 212  
 Philonenko, Marc, 58  
 Pitre, Brant, 357  
 Puech, Émile, 119  
 Rad, Gerhard von, 67, 73, 102, 233  
 Ravid, Leora, 26, 122, 124, 212  
 Reed, Annette Yoshiko, 215, 266, 271

- Regev, Eyal, 455  
 Rofé, Alexander, 170, 241, 248  
 Rollmann, Hans, 48, 49  
 Rönsch, H., 142, 232  
 Rowland, Christopher, 18, 38, 43, 64, 65, 68, 70, 81, 95, 99, 100, 101, 209  
 Rowley, H. H., 142, 158, 160, 162, 384, 399, 414  
 Rowley, Harold Henry, 39, 40  
 Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. van, 156, 211, 229  
 Russell, D. S., 17, 40, 41, 42, 67, 81, 278, 299, 384, 414  
 Russell, Jeffrey Burton, 291, 299  
 Sacchi, Paolo, 61, 188, 266, 267  
 Sanders, E. P., 54, 81, 95, 99, 100, 101, 188  
 Schmidt, Johann Michael, 34, 37, 38, 39, 45, 46, 49  
 Schmithals, Walter, 45  
 Schubert, Friedemann, 22, 23, 27, 145  
 Schürer, Emil, 39, 142, 143, 151  
 Schwarz, Eberhard, 143, 232  
 Scott, James M., 26, 356, 391, 431, 437  
 Seeligmann, Isac Leo, 279  
 Segal, Michael, 5, 6, 21, 122, 126, 129, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 199, 210, 212, 213, 230, 269, 270, 274, 280, 289, 291, 292, 294, 298, 396, 419, 470  
 Sinding, Michael, 4, 108  
 Skehan, Patrick W., 441, 442  
 Smith, Jonathan Z., 187, 233  
 Smith, Morton, 30  
 Stegemann, Hartmut, 22, 58, 65, 68, 71, 74, 76, 77, 82, 92, 95, 96, 98  
 Stone, Michael E., 18, 38, 45, 65, 71, 72, 81, 100, 177, 185, 187, 188, 191, 233, 237, 239, 275, 325, 368  
 Stuckenbruck, Loren T., 270  
 Sturm, Richard E., 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 77, 81, 84, 92, 93  
 Suter, David Winston, 187, 238, 266  
 Swales, John, 108  
 Talmon, Shemaryahu, 186  
 Testuz, Michel, 21, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 129, 130, 144, 151, 165, 170, 179, 274, 320, 321, 325, 328, 384, 391, 431  
 Tigchelaar, Eibert, 52, 83, 91, 103, 118, 289  
 Tiller, Patrick A., 156, 193, 316, 317, 362, 363, 441  
 Ulrich, Eugene, 186, 278  
 VanderKam, James C., 67, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 129, 130, 131, 133, 142, 143, 146, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 160, 164, 165, 168, 176, 179, 186, 187, 210, 212, 215, 222, 224, 225, 229, 231, 232, 233, 239, 247, 249, 256, 267, 270, 274, 278, 286, 317, 321, 373, 375, 396, 402, 410, 421, 422, 429, 430, 431, 437, 443, 444, 445, 447, 450, 451, 453, 454, 456, 462, 466, 467, 472, 485, 499  
 Vermès, Géza, 143, 289  
 Vielhauer, Philipp, 40, 41, 42, 44, 65, 69, 81  
 Volz, Paul, 399  
 Wacholder, Ben Zion, 143, 167, 231  
 Wellhausen, Julius, 324  
 Werman, Cana, 123, 124, 126, 128, 129, 144, 145, 151, 153, 160, 167, 170, 212, 254, 325, 437  
 Wiesenberg, Ernest, 122, 130  
 Wintermute, O. S., 229  
 Wray, T. J., 291, 299, 306  
 Wright, Benjamin G., 212, 247, 280, 434  
 Zeitlin, Solomon, 142, 152  
 Zimmerli, Walther, 324  
 Zuurmond, R., 113